

NOV 8 1948

# **THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY**

## **TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF EDUCATING EDUCATORS**

**E. George Payne, *Issue Editor***

Twenty-five Years of Educating Educators  
*E. George Payne* 67

The Growth in Students and Development of  
Facilities *E. George Payne* 80

Twenty-five Years of Curriculum Growth  
in the School of Education *John C. Payne* 86

Human Relations in Teacher Training  
*Dan W. Dodson* 106

Democracy and Interfaith *Abraham I. Katsh* 116

The Student-Activities Program: Training for  
Democratic Living *Jesse J. Dossick* 136

About the Finished Product *Ira M. Kline* 154

Editorial, 65

**OCTOBER 1948**

# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

32 WASHINGTON PLACE, NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

## *Editorial Staff*

E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor-in-Chief*      JOHN C. PAYNE, *Asst. Managing Editor*  
DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Editor*      JEAN B. BARR, *Business Manager*

HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, RHEA K. BOARDMAN, FREDERIC M. THRASHER,  
STEPHEN G. RICH, I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, *Associate Editors*

## *Permanent Department*

Book Reviews, HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, *Editor*

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

## *Board of Trustees*

E. GEORGE PAYNE, <i>President</i>	MAURICE MOFFATT
HERBERT D. HARPER, <i>Vice-President</i>	STEPHEN G. RICH
HENRY W. MEISSNER, <i>Secretary</i>	WILLIAM ROSENGARTEN, SR.
I. DAVID SATLOW, <i>Treasurer</i>	W. CLINTON STUART
DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Trustee</i>	

---

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, Room 52, 32 Washington Place, New York 3, N.Y. Editorial office, Room 41, 32 Washington Place, New York 3, N.Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.







# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

*A Magazine of Theory and Practice*

---

Vol. 22

October 1948

No. 2

---

## EDITORIAL

This issue of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is devoted to the history of the twenty-five years of the School of Education of New York University beginning with the year 1922. It does not attempt to do more than interpret the spirit of the School and only indicates in the briefest fashion some of the reasons for its existence and for its remarkable growth and influence. There is too much material to include in one number of THE JOURNAL, even an enlarged number. It is hoped that the publication of this material will inspire one of the students of the School during this twenty-five-year period to write a complete history of it. Such a history would make a topic for a doctor's dissertation and, if published, would be a unique record of educational achievement in the twentieth century. THE JOURNAL has done its part to make the material of these twenty-five years of the School's development available for educators, and it remains the responsibility of others to complete the task.

Each article in the issue speaks for itself. There have been a minimum of editorial changes. Only when additions were necessary to ensure historical accuracy have changes been made. Wherever opinions have been expressed, they

Copyright 1948 by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

are the opinions of the writers and they assume full responsibility for them. Each of the writers has been for at least a decade intimately associated with the School during the period covered. They, each and every one, show the influence exerted by the associations in the School and they are probably prejudiced. But I believe that readers will agree with the Editor that they have shown keen insight and discrimination in describing a thrilling and unforgettable experience in their lives.

E. GEORGE PAYNE

## TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF EDUCATING EDUCATORS

E. George Payne

During the fifty years of my active educational experience and professional life, I have witnessed the most extensive transformation of social life in the history of civilization. This evolution has been brought about by the application of science and invention to industry, commerce, transportation, and communication and by the resultant changes in the way of living. It was during this period that earlier inventions, those of the last half of the nineteenth century, such as the streetcar, the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, and the like, came to fruition. Such notable inventions as the automobile, the radio, the motion picture, and a thousand others almost equally important also greatly influenced social reconstruction.

The impact of this material and scientific advance had its inevitable influence upon culture, the social practices, and the ideals and social patterns of the age. Ways of living were revolutionized in their most fundamental aspects. There is no need to detail those changes, for all the literature of the period, both popular and scientific, is replete with comment on the extent and elaboration of interdependence and the far-reaching effects of this material and social reconstruction. The nature of our interrelatedness and interdependence, as characterized by the concept, One World, has been accepted and reasonably well understood by the ordinary citizen of the world, at least by the average citizen of our country.

We are not, however, quite so familiar with the fact that education has undergone a somewhat similar change, both in theory and practice, although this evolution has been less marked. Space does not permit me to detail those far-reaching educational changes, for we are concerned here with the development of a single institution in the last half of this

fifty-year period. The story of the development of this institution and its place in the total educational picture of the period cannot be told here as it is foreign to the particular purpose of this article and, for that matter, to the complete series of articles that comprise this issue.

We hope in this article, so far as possible, to define the scope, purpose, functions, and spirit of this remarkable institution that has made such a rich contribution to education. One can only understand its development in terms of its underlying philosophy and characteristic spirit. This was stated adequately by the person who was responsible for the formulation of the philosophy of the institution, its first Dean, John W. Withers. Dean Withers came to New York University in February 1921 after a lengthy educational experience, including one term as superintendent of the St. Louis public schools. He continued, first as Dean of the School of Pedagogy and later of the School of Education for seventeen years, the name of the School having been changed in 1922. During the period of his deanship he outlined in numerous reports, speeches, and publications the complete philosophy, policy, programs, and purposes of the School. It is hoped that some student or faculty member will undertake, while the two deans are still living, a complete research into the data now readily available, and provide for the educational public a complete picture of the contributions of this remarkable man to the development of education in the twentieth century, especially in the development of a School that became the largest and perhaps the most significant of its kind in the world.

Under the title: "Scope, Functions, and Purposes of the Departments of the School of Education," he states his philosophy as follows:

The aim and purpose of the School of Education is to assist as far as possible in the solution of the problems of American education in two general directions: first, the extension of tested knowledge in

education in all of its phases and at all levels, and, secondly, the promotion of better application of tested knowledge in the improvement of educational practice.

It proposes to realize this aim chiefly through four lines of effort:

(1) the professional education and training of teachers and others for the various kinds of service needed in education; (2) research and publication of results; (3) field council and advice in the way of lectures, conferences, surveys, comparative studies, committee service, and so forth; and (4) promulgation of an educational philosophy in harmony with the spirit and needs of present-day life.

These problems and types of service arise out of the educational needs of a changing civilization and in connection with an imperfectly integrated system of education that has been developed to meet these needs. They are not therefore separate and independent of each other. Consequently, any institution that would be efficient in dealing with them must itself be sufficiently unified and integrated for this purpose.

The kind and degree of unity required depends primarily on the character of the work to be done. This work, though essentially connected, naturally falls into several well-defined fields, each of which calls for specialized knowledge, skills, and ability, in addition to the general cultural and professional education that is considered fundamental to all of them.

Therefore in order to accomplish the task that it has undertaken, the School of Education has been organized with the definite purpose of providing expert service of a high degree of excellence in all these fields. Since no faculty could possibly be found whose members are equally at home and sufficiently expert in all of them, the carrying out of this purpose necessarily involves a kind of departmental organization which, however, must not be confused with what has come to be characteristic of schools and colleges devoted to academic education. These two forms of departmental organization as functional units within a faculty have some things in common but there are many differences between them that are vital and must not be overlooked. These differences are found both in matters of instruction and research. In matters of instruction one form is concerned with the promotion of cultural or liberal education so-called, the other with professional education. Liberal education places emphasis primarily upon subject matter, the acquisition of knowledge, and the mastery of content. The question that is always uppermost is what is the value and importance of this subject? What will it do for the student if he thoroughly masters it? Can he be considered liberally educated with-

out it? The subject and its mastery are the important things, not what the student will do with the subject when he gets it. Chancellor Capen has said that the college, with us, is the product of an alien culture which, in spite of its popularity, has never been quite at home in the United States. Whether we accept this statement or not, it is true that the central purpose of colleges devoted to the arts and sciences has been and now is the extension through research and the dissemination, through teaching and publication, of knowledge for its own sake and with little direct reference to its practical bearing upon the occupations of the post-college life.

In professional education on the other hand emphasis is placed primarily upon the use that is to be made of what the student learns. The question is not what will the subject, if thoroughly mastered, do for him but what will he do with the subject. The subject matter of instruction is secondary. Its use is primary. Since the student in the professional schools does not as a rule have time to master completely any of the subjects that he studies, even if it were desirable that he should do so, the problem of such a school is to determine whether any given subject will be useful to him at all in the practice of his profession, and, if it is decided that it will be, then what parts of it will he certainly need to know and how shall these parts be selected, organized, and presented so as to make them most available when he shall need to use them in practice.

Therefore in carrying out the first of the four lines of effort constituting the program of the School of Education; namely, the professional education and training of teachers and of others for the various kinds of service needed in education, the principle by which the faculty must be guided primarily is this: whatever the student needs to know or to be able to do to fit him for successful practice in the field of professional service that he is planning to enter must be taught him. It is the nature of this service, not what subjects he is taught or by whom he is taught, that constitutes the determining factor. If this principle is accepted as fundamental in the organization and administration of our curricula and courses of instruction—and there appears to be little need of professional schools unless it is accepted—certain facts stand out clearly about the extent and kinds of co-operation among the departments of the School of Education that are needed for the proper conduct of our work in the matter of instruction. Among these facts the following should be mentioned:

1. The number of distinct occupations into which the profession of education in the United States is divided is already very great and



increasing. In the New York City school system alone some two hundred and fifty are recognized as sufficiently different and distinct to require action of the Board of Examiners to select those who may be certified for service in them. All of these occupations require professional training, a part of which can and should be taken in a professional school such as ours. It is obviously impossible for such a school to set up a special department for each of these occupations. However, with few exceptions they may be classified into groups that fall readily into fields of service for which the faculty of the School of Education is now organized.

2. The special knowledges, skills, and abilities that are peculiar to each of these groups and that can be taught in the School of Education more quickly and economically than they can be learned by apprenticeship in the occupations themselves should be ascertained by that department of the faculty which is responsible for the field of service to which the occupation belongs. The required special knowledges, skills, and abilities ascertained in this way should be organized into courses for which the department should provide instruction.

In planning and giving these courses, however, two things must not be confused. The students who come to us need instruction and training that will enable them to do the work successfully that is required of them and in the way that is required. This means that the members of the faculty who are concerned with those courses should know as well as possible what is actually being required in those occupations as the work is now being done in the schools over the country and especially in those in which our students are interested. This calls for co-operative study and mutual good understanding between the faculty members and the field forces in charge of these occupations. We cannot ignore these significant practical facts and, through isolation, or any other cause, grow too theoretical and idealistic in planning and giving those special courses. In any case, it certainly will not do to devote a course, take the student's money, and consume his time in explaining to him on the basis of our superior wisdom, real or supposed, that the occupation in which he is engaged or into which he is preparing to go is all wrong both in theory and practice as it is being carried on in the school or system in which he is employed or is planning to enter. Any department of the School of Education may in this way soon lose its opportunity to be of much real service to any school system toward whose work it has or is thought to have such an attitude of "high-hatted" superiority.

On the other hand, faculty members, as expert students of these occupations, should contribute as far as possible toward their improvement by a scientific study carried on both within the department and in co-operation with the field forces outside, by publishing books and articles disseminating the results of such studies, by conferences for mutual interchange of experiences and ideas, and by any other method that may seem feasible and legitimate. This is essential to the program of the School of Education as we have planned it.

3. In the third place, not all of the special training needed for any of the occupations with which our students are concerned can be given or should be attempted in the School of Education. The great majority of our students when they matriculate with us have already had more or less of professional education and actual experience. What do we do for them should therefore be conditioned not only by the sort of professional service they are to render when they leave us but also by the professional experience and equipment that they already have when they come to us. For every one of these students the curriculum that should be provided is in reality an individual matter. It is therefore quite obvious that their needs, even in the way of specialized training, cannot be met by any rigidly organized scheme of departmental courses which are offered to them on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. For those students, and even for those who come to us without professional experience directly from the high schools, there is need of departmental co-operation in planning suitable courses and curricula. What they should be equipped for when they leave us as well as what they are when they come to us both require this. For the professionalized general education and the generalized professional education which are basic to each of the occupations within the profession of education, materials that are needed must be chosen from many fields and subjects of study and combined into courses so organized and related as to guarantee their best functioning in the practical work of our students in these occupations.

This is by no means an easy thing to do, not only because of the difficulty of analyzing the various occupations to determine the professional education that they each require but also because of the subtle and more or less unconscious influence which our own academic education exerts upon us as teachers. All of us are more or less inclined to teach and to evaluate subject matter in the way and from the viewpoint in which we ourselves were taught. It is no doubt a fact that the best and most inspiring teachers whom many of us knew in college were subject-matter enthusiasts, academically minded and inclined to magnify, exalt, and glorify the subjects which they taught.

They imparted to us much of their own enthusiasm to make scholarship—in the sense of thorough and complete mastery of the subjects that we studied under them—our educational ideal. Such teachers are rare. Wherever they are found their services must be recognized as of the highest value in any institution devoted to culture and liberal education.

The reason is obvious, for the success of the student in any such institution, granting that he has the necessary native capacity, is determined by two conditions: (1) by the interest in the subject which he developed under such inspiring leadership, and (2) by his ability to build each year's work in a subject, which he pursues through a large part or even the whole of his college life, upon a foundation of thorough mastery of the work that he has previously done. It is this enthusiasm, born of conscious mastery under the leadership of a great teacher, that causes the student to form the ideal of scholarship which carries him through college into the graduate school, there to devote himself to research to extend the bounds of knowledge in his favorite subject.

Unfortunately, it does not follow that a great teacher in an academic institution will prove to be great or even satisfactory in a professional school for the reason already stated—that in a professional school subject matter and its mastery are not considered to be the matters that are of first importance. We are not primarily interested, as in schools devoted to scholarship, in the tracing of fact-to-fact relationships in a given subject, but rather in the tracing of fact-to-purpose relationships, which is quite a different thing. Because of this, we often find it necessary to cut across subject-matter boundaries in search of the facts that we need. Overlooking this truth, teachers in professional schools who have had good college training are very apt, as validated knowledge in their special fields becomes considerably extended, to organize this knowledge into courses which, taken together, cover the whole field and to insist that these courses are so fundamentally valuable in professional education that all students must take them. This attitude is likely to be accentuated if the teachers of these courses are also engaged in research in the fields represented, because their recent discoveries are apt to have an undue value attached to them. Therefore because of the constant increase of professional knowledge in all fields of education and because of the changed character of old occupations and the development of new ones for which professional education is required and which we are called upon to supply, there is great and increasing need of the co-

operative study of the problems occasioned by these and other conditions which I have described.

4. Another set of facts affecting the future of instruction in the School of Education must be considered. These are involved in the organization and length of curricula. During the past several years, education has gone forward by leaps and bounds, the result of a number of causes the nature and probable continuance of which we as a faculty should study. For they will affect materially the character and length of the curricula that we shall have to provide. This influence is not likely to be seriously felt in the immediate future, but within the next ten or fifteen years it will probably have considerable effect on the policy and organization of the School of Education.

It is not necessary here to do more than mention some of these causes and call attention to their probable results. Some of them are inherent in present civilization and are therefore likely to be permanent. Among these the following are of particular interest: (a) the intense faith of the American people in science and the rapid extension of scientific knowledge in every direction of human interest. This movement has added immensely to the stores of knowledge now available for education; (b) the universal and eager disposition to apply the discoveries of science, through invention and otherwise, to the development and satisfaction of human desires. To make this knowledge available for this purpose requires various kinds of expert service which can only be supplied by adequate technical and professional education; (c) the enormous and increasing national and individual wealth now available with which to assist in developing and satisfying the wants of life.

The influence of these three causes upon education both general and professional has already been marvelous. The indications are that general collegiate education of the four-year type with which we have become familiar is going to have to fight hard for its life if these causes continue. The reasons for this statement will be understood by a brief glance at the ways in which technical and professional education have developed. All occupations for which this sort of education becomes ultimately necessary have their beginning in the activities of life outside of school and college. The special skills and knowledges required for their pursuit in the beginning are acquired by participation in the occupations themselves. By and by, as the occupations grow and the special skills and knowledges required increase in number, difficulty, and complexity so that acquiring them through participation becomes too expensive if not impossible, assistance is sought in schools

and colleges because the knowledge which these institutions are in possession of can be made available to master the techniques required. The amount of such institutional assistance sought is determined by the extent to which the kind of expert service required by the occupation is developed.

If Dean Withers should rewrite this paper today, he would perhaps make additions to it in the light of world experience since its composition. However, the statement serves our purposes, for it expresses clearly the philosophy and positions basic to the development of the School of Education.

However, the greatness or importance of an institution and the character and effectiveness of its contributions is not determined wholly by its philosophy, although an underlying philosophy clearly expressed and closely adhered to is essential to greatness of achievement. What is even more important is the spirit or what might be designated the "soul" of an institution. This does not find expression merely in a reasoned philosophy or principles underlying practices, but even more in the emotions, in the attitudes, the spirit and feeling underlying the institution's practices. It is not merely what an institution thinks that makes it significant but also the spirit with which it carries out the realization of its tasks. It is in this aspect of the development of the School of Education that we find its unique character, its personality, and its most distinct achievements. The School has striven day in and day out throughout the past twenty-five years to attain this full realization and it is for its achievement in this respect that it is known, remembered, and loved by thousands of students who have enjoyed the experience of living in an atmosphere of mutual trust, sympathy, understanding, and helpfulness. On the whole the faculty, in all these years, have sacrificed peculiar personal interests in the realization of this common ideal. Such a spirit of co-operation and understanding I have not experienced in any other relationship of my career. The task of



portraying these characteristics as they were lived in the School is too great for any one person. Therefore, I can only say that I have lived a glorious life, in this quarter of a century of faculty and student co-operation on behalf of living and learning.

Then what are the factors that express the spirit or "soul" of the School of Education and that are responsible for its achievements? I shall try to answer this question as I see it.

1. The first and most important of these factors is democracy. We need here to define what we mean by democracy, for it has no meaning as it is used in the literature of the world today. Or we might more accurately say that it means everything and different things to different groups using the term. We mean by democracy a social organization or community of human beings in which every individual—both faculty and students—is stimulated and given free opportunity to realize his potentialities and to express his personality without artificial restrictions. This implies complete freedom from dominance of one personality by another. It implies an atmosphere and an organization in which one lives joyously, develops freely, and experiences unrestrictedly his highest ideals of service and actions. I have in mind also to contrast this concept of democracy with the common notion and practice that conceives democracy as voting, holding conferences for purposes of more or less fruitless discussion, or what is worse for purposes of imposing one's ideas upon others of the group, and a variety of other such functions, perhaps essential in a democracy, but which may be meaningless; that is, they may be mere forms. In other words a sort of red tape that involves democratic forms but provides no real opportunity for the essence of democratic living. The School of Education has realized the concept of democracy as I have outlined it to an extent not realized in any other institution in the country. I am confident that the thousands of students in this twenty-five-year period will confirm this judgment.

2. The second factor through which the School has realized its purposes is the organization it developed and through which it carried on its work. The concept of organization is well developed in Dean Withers' statement quoted above. In the beginning the Dean contemplated the development of a large school that would require the best abilities of a large number of men and women. The organization,



therefore, involved departments with chairmen who, with the Dean, provided a cabinet for the discussion and development of policies. He conceived an organization that would stimulate thinking at its best. The thinking of the faculty as a whole, because of its variety and complexity, frequently degenerates into fruitless discussion with little cerebration. Of course the policies formulated in the smaller coherent group were fully discussed in the faculty as a whole and modified accordingly. These departmental chairmen, moreover, were given a free hand to carry out these policies when once formulated with and through the members of the department selected by them for the task. For the most part, these chairmen, under the leadership of the Dean, functioned in a democratic fashion and every person was not only in a position to realize his best potentialities, but also to contribute his energies and capacities to the realization of the program and policies of the institution. In spite of some weaknesses that are inevitable in any organization, on the whole, this plan provides for the freest expression and the utmost contribution of every member of the faculty.

3. The third factor in the development of the School was the attitude of the faculty toward the students. This might be expressed in many ways. One characteristic attitude was "the student is always right until he is proved to be wrong." Conflicts are always likely to arise and it makes a difference how the instructor feels and acts toward him. If the instructor assumes that he might be wrong and sits down with the student in that attitude to discuss the problems that arise, the result is bound to be favorable. This attitude of regarding the student as equal and his points of view as important was of paramount importance. It increased the student's self-respect and the feeling of importance of his own personality, a feeling necessary for creative effort. In other words, it was not merely the function of the instructor to teach. It was primarily the function of the instructor to participate with the student in the learning of wisdom. This camaraderie, this democracy of attitude is perhaps the most fundamental element in the greatness and the contribution of the institution. It contrasts completely with the accepted university practice.

This does not mean that the instructor is not a scholar who is unfamiliar with his field of learning. It does not even mean that he does not know infinitely more of the subject he teaches than the students. But the attitude of co-operative learning, or learning as a joint enterprise, stimulated the student to his highest endeavors. His personality grew and flourished under sympathy and understanding. In other words the student was always regarded as a human being who had

ideas and a personality of his own and whose intellectual growth could only take place by the expression of those ideas in a free discussion where errors might be detected and corrected.

4. The fourth factor basic to the institution was the attitude of the faculty toward the educator on the job and his problems. The philosophy underlying this attitude is well stated in the material quoted from Dean Withers. It was never assumed that the School of Education or the individual members of the faculty had all the solutions for the problems facing the educator in the American public schools. Nor did they assume that the educators were without expert knowledge and excellent ability to face and solve the problems of their various communities. Therefore, the relationship of the faculty to the educator on the job was one of mutual trust and help. The whole attitude of the faculty was to strengthen the educator, to give him confidence in his own ability and understanding, and to help him think through the problems of education in his community. The solution of the problem of education was regarded as a mutual task and required co-operative efforts and mutual help, in which the faculty brought their theoretical knowledge and expertness and the schoolman his practical knowledge of the community to the particular situation involved. There developed mutual trust and appreciation, each side benefiting from the association in the solution of common problems. The association was a complete democracy of relationship and mutual understanding. This friendly and understanding attitude on the part of the faculty soon created confidence among the educational public and a wide call from educators for help in the solution of their problems. Large numbers of these school people—teachers, supervisors, and administrators—flocked to the institution and brought with them their problems for solution. On the other hand, the faculty went out in the field and met these men on their own home ground and, without seeking credit for themselves, gave encouragement and advice.

5. The fifth factor that needs consideration is closely related to the one just discussed; namely, the development of the Institute of Education which rendered aid to thousands of schools throughout the eastern half of the United States. We quote from the first bulletin of the Institute: "The Institute of Education of New York University has been established to provide professional training for teachers and others engaged in educational service throughout the United States. . . . In carrying these plans, the Institute of Education does not intend to duplicate or compete with the work of other educational institutions. It is proposed, rather, to co-operate with and supplement

the work of other agencies throughout the country having similar objects. In no case will a center be established in any community without the approval of the responsible educational authorities in that community." We are not here concerned with the organization of the off-campus work carried on by the Institute of Education, but rather with the opportunity that this organization provided for the demonstration of the spirit of helpful sympathy and co-operation. Here was something new in off-campus work. Off-campus work was regarded as an essential part of the program of every faculty member. He was expected to undertake this work so that he would retain the sympathy and understanding with the difficulties of the man on the job and learn to help solve those problems. Each member of the faculty had to become something more than a theorist. He was valuable only in so far as he could offer practical help. The value of this field contact was inestimable. It had perhaps more to do with the growth of the School of Education than any other item. The Institute was established in 1924 and by 1928 the number of off-campus students almost equaled the more than four thousand resident students. It was not, however, the contacts that this large number of students brought about but the spirit operative in the solution of mutual problems that was significant.

6. Finally, one other item needs special emphasis, although it has been suggested by this whole discussion; namely, the spirit of friendship that prevailed among the faculty on the one hand, and the faculty and students and educational public on the other. The fundamental ideal prevailed that the Dean and members of the faculty were easily available to students and educators. The latchstring was always outside the door and every one could come with his problems and go away feeling that he had a friend in a faculty member. He was, moreover, spiritually uplifted by the contact. The faculty member was never allowed to forget that mental growth hinges upon the attitudes and feelings of the individual and that these must be taken into account in all relationships. This ideal was practiced by every official and clerk of the institution, as well as by the faculty. The School of Education of New York University was known as a friendly institution.

Space does not permit the further elaboration of the items mentioned or the discussion of many others that give the institution its personality, but those mentioned will indicate some of the most vital reasons for the amazing growth and accomplishments of the institution. It is not our problem or purpose to suggest the future trend of

the School or the nature of its further development and progress. Furthermore, we are fully aware that the postwar world will provide many new problems and will require many new approaches to the new situations, but we also believe that the fundamental elements of the philosophy and spirit as outlined in the preceding pages which have been responsible for the growth and influence of the School of Education will be just as necessary and fundamental in its future progress, for they are basic to all growth and progress.

## THE GROWTH IN STUDENTS AND DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES

E. George Payne

In the first issue of the *Alumni Bulletin* of the School of Education in 1928, I wrote:

In a century of remarkable achievements in the social world and extraordinary advancements along educational lines, no event of greater importance has happened than the development of the School of Education of New York University. Dean Withers came to the School in 1921 when there was an attendance of 141 students (all part time). This attendance has grown to approximately four thousand this semester, and the number will undoubtedly pass the five-thousand mark during the current year. In addition, we have approximately three thousand students in the Institute of Education, an integral part of the School of Education. This means that the faculty of the School of Education has contact, perhaps, with more students than any other school of education in the United States.

There is no better way of indicating the remarkable growth of the School during the period 1921-1946 than to present a table of the attendance year by year. The table below does not include off-campus attendance, but only full-time and part-time resident students.

## FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME RESIDENT STUDENTS

<i>Year</i>	<i>No. Students</i>	<i>No. Points*</i>
1920-1921	141	
1921-1922	221	
1922-1923	542	
1923-1924	872	
1924-1925	1,189	5,100
1925-1926	1,830	17,141
1926-1927	2,671	29,863
1927-1928	4,013	43,574
1928-1929	4,984	54,013
1929-1930	7,234	69,710
1930-1931	7,493	79,188
1931-1932	8,269	94,637
1932-1933	7,943	93,965
1933-1934	7,039	83,422
1934-1935	7,355	82,911
1935-1936**	8,771	91,022
1936-1937**	9,896	100,554
1937-1938**	11,274	111,711
1938-1939**	12,083	123,627
1939-1940†	11,632	122,143
1940-1941†	11,132	113,936
1941-1942†	9,039	96,025
1942-1943††	6,840	73,328
1943-1944	6,496	70,026
1944-1945	7,766	91,491
1945-1946	9,235	117,203

---

\*Where no figures are given, they are not available.

\*\* The following should be included as resident points from Hofstra College: 1935-1936, 2,876; 1936-1937, 4,087; 1937-1938, 5,638; 1938-1939, 6,126.

† The following should be included as resident points from a center on Long Island: 1939-1940, 2,623; 1940-1941, 1,910; 1941-1942, 564.

†† The decline in attendance from 1942 to 1945 was the result of the Second World War, when many men students were in the service; during that time, there was an increase in women students.

Many of the fundamental reasons for the growth of the School have been indicated in a previous article. In addition, the increased interest in education following the First World War and a corresponding increase in teachers' salaries made training for the profession more attractive. But these facts did not explain the growth of the School of Education. That came from its philosophy and spirit, its program and its purpose, and in its provision for advanced study in a variety of fields for which adequate provision had not formerly been made in the professional institutions of the country. Among the more important of these were music, physical education, vocational education, art, and business education. All of these departments grew rapidly from the time of their introduction and accounted for a large part of the early growth of the School.

#### **Development of Facilities**

The growth in registration made an increase in facilities for classrooms and office space necessary. The faculty of the School of Education faced the problem in a unique and vigorous fashion. According to my recollection, in 1925, the faculty, with the permission and co-operation of the University, organized the School of Education Realty Corporation of New York University. This corporation entered into a trust agreement with the Title Guarantee and Trust Company of New York under the terms of which the Title Guarantee and Trust Company became the trustee of the debenture bonds of the Realty Corporation.

It was found that the three buildings on the front of the block between Washington Place and West Fourth Street, and the ground they occupied, could be purchased for approximately one million dollars. The faculty hoped, through the sale of 6 per cent Realty Corporation bonds to realize enough not only to purchase these buildings but to construct the necessary building for the adequate housing of the



School. The Corporation authorized the issue of \$900,000 worth of 6 per cent bonds. Up to October 1925, \$250,000 worth had been sold and soon thereafter the amount reached nearly one-half million dollars, which provided sufficient funds to take title to the property.

The significant fact about this issue was that it was sold without the usual commission cost and nearly half of it was taken by the faculty and students of the School of Education. This was the spirit that made the School. It so impressed members of the University Council and men of finance that they came to its assistance, both in the purchase of bonds and with gifts. By 1928, the construction of a new building (costing with the land \$1,607,948) on the corner of West Fourth Street and Green Street was begun, and the dedication of the School of Education Building took place in February 1930. Later, the University paid off the bonds of the Realty Corporation, and assumed the entire outstanding debt.

Chancellor Elmer Ellsworth Brown in a note to the alumni wrote the following:

The initiative and enthusiasm of the alumni of our School of Education and their readiness to enter upon large undertakings for the good of the School are among the brighter aspects of the larger New York University life today. Members of the Council of New York University have been most happily impressed with these manifestations. Like produces like, and members of the University Council are responding to this spirit. Led by the committee consisting of Dr. Munn, Dr. Nichols, and Mr. Percy Straus, they have gone deep into their own bank accounts—how many hundreds of thousand dollars deep I would not say—to make it possible to begin this year the erection of the School of Education building group, with a notable edifice on the northwest corner of Fourth and Greene Streets. How largely this whole development is due to the inspiring leadership of Dean Withers is a fact familiar to the alumni generally, as to all other members and friends of the School of Education.

A quotation from the School of Education *Alumni Bulletin* for 1928 is significant:

The Council of New York University has authorized the erection of a new building to accommodate an important part of the work of the School of Education. The building will be located on a plot one hundred feet square on the northwest corner of Fourth and Greene Streets, just off Washington Square, and will be twelve stories in height. The site combines a recent purchase with a plot acquired in 1925 by the School of Education Realty Corporation.

The erection of this building is the first step in the realization of a comprehensive program for the development of the School of Education. The building will be Gothic in design and will set a standard for the University's architecture at Washington Square. Plans have been completed and filed, and the demolition of the structures now occupying the site of the new building will begin as soon as the leases of the occupants of the present buildings expire.

The new building housed the special activities and departments of the School of Education, and provided some classroom space for other classes, but was hardly adequate for the needs of the School and other divisions of the University at Washington Square. However, the depression of 1929 halted further building.

One need was filled—that of housing the students of the School, which now came to us from almost every state in the Union and from many foreign countries. In spite of the depression, the University purchased the Judson Hotel on the south side of the Square and converted it into a residence hall. This met in part the needs for housing, not only for the students of the School of Education but for those of other schools.

When I became Dean in 1938, one more valuable addition was obtained. The department of vocational education had outgrown its facilities in the School of Education Building. The Hebrew Technical Institute at Stuyvesant and East Ninth Streets about that time decided to discontinue its

work and transfer its students to the technical schools of the City. The University authorities got in touch with the Board of the Hebrew Technical Institute, with the result that the latter's three buildings were leased for a period of twenty years for a nominal sum and certain scholarship privileges. The Board of the Institute has been most generous, so that, with the equipment in the buildings and that which the department of vocational education had obtained, these buildings are now among the best equipped of their kind in the country.

In this way the building program of the twenty-five-year period was brought to an end, representing one of the most active building periods in the University's history. It will undoubtedly be surpassed by the present proposals for the New York University Bellevue Medical Center and the Law Center. But the unique example of financing and building on the part of the students and faculty of the School of Education is a monument to their vision, courage, determination, and self-sacrifice.

## **TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF CURRICULUM GROWTH IN THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**John C. Payne**

The history of the curriculum in any institution has general interest only if it qualifies as a case study of some kind—in cause and effect, for example, or in educational techniques, or in the expression of a philosophy of education. As a mere chronicle of event or name, it would have an interest pretty largely limited to the numerous band of the institution's "relatives." To others, it would be no more exciting than the family album of some chance host who imposed his pride and nostalgia upon an alien tribesman with different traditions and memories. Such an exercise in egoism is not the spirit of this report. There is less of celebration in this recounting of twenty-five years of curricular history than there is of analysis. The School of Education "family" can take what pride it will in the record, but the record is reviewed for the philosophy it represented, the motivations it demonstrated, the possibilities it achieved.

When one examines the current listings of curricula in the School of Education announcements and discovers that there are approximately seventy different undergraduate curricula and two hundred and twenty-five different graduate curricula, he is likely to be awed by the sheer size of the institution, and to question the typicality of this institution as a case study. Only a few, however, would hold that the valid measure of an educational institution is to be found directly from the number and variety of course-of-study offerings or from any other evidence relating simply to volume. Too much has been said about the effectiveness of Mark Hopkins on his end of the log for "bigness" to be mistaken for "essence." The significance of "bigness" is primarily to be found in what that bigness reflects and sec-

ondarily in what it may portend. The single moment of curricular lushness is less important than the trend it represents, the trend is less important than the basic causes, and both are less important than the potential of educational service represented.

The twenty-five years, 1922-1946, which this report embraces were years of amazing development in higher education in general and in the professional education of teachers in particular. It is an inescapable conclusion that the growth of the School of Education in these years was to some extent inclusive of educational unearned increment, of fortuitous upsurge on a rising educational market. This was not, of course, peculiar to the School of Education. It was merely part of the educational climate in which schools of education, generally, functioned. It made pioneering easier, perhaps, but no more certainly correct and inspired than before. Educational enterprises, like business enterprises, have their "fullness of time"; some institutions of both types use the privilege well, and some mushroom unhealthfully only to wither when sterner tests and times come to be met.

It was in this fullness of time, after the First World War, that Dr. John W. Withers came to New York University, took the School of Pedagogy which he found there, and created the new School of Education. He waved no magic wand to produce at once ten, forty, and then seventy curricula where one curriculum had been. These growths came gradually but steadily over the years. The significant thing was that, as his students increased in numbers—a development which would have been likely no matter how static the curriculum in the early twenties—he and his staff sought to anticipate the increased variation in the needs of the larger group seeking admission. As boards of education and state departments groped for better teachers and came to rely on "more education," the School of Education varied the possibilities of this added education. The early state-defined



educational requirements were not overly burdened with specifics on what the education should be. They were often stated in terms of degrees or in terms of semester hours in professional education or the field of specialization. Yet in the very first years of the history of the School of Education there is a richness of curriculum offerings, unusual in no small degree.

The point needs illustration. Take, for example, the offerings available in the School of Education in 1923, one year after its reorganization. Eleven separate "educational" departments had been established. Content work was still largely offered for School of Education students in the other undergraduate colleges of the University. The departments identified above included: educational sociology, elementary education, secondary education, commercial education, educational psychology, experimental education, general theory of education, philosophy of education, history of education, educational administration, and supervision of instruction. Altogether, one hundred and twenty-one different courses are indicated in the catalogue for that year, of which twenty-two courses were open to graduate students only. A major faculty of thirteen full-time members, assisted by a part-time staff of nineteen others, was responsible for the entire program. In Dr. Margaret Noonan's elementary-education department, there were methods courses in the teaching of language, reading, social studies, arithmetic, and even woodwork; there were courses in general methods, principles, and tests and measurements, and special courses for the teachers of the blind, the mentally defective, and those retarded in speech development. In Dr. E. George Payne's educational-sociology department, there were, in addition to the basic courses in the field, courses in accident prevention, health, immigrant education, and American citizenship. In Dr. P. W. L. Cox's secondary-education department, there were general courses in



principles and problems both for the junior and senior high schools and for the small and large high schools; there were, moreover, numerous courses in the teaching of special subjects. The courses in educational psychology, taught primarily by Professors Robert Mac Dougall and Charles Benson, ranged far beyond the introductory, traditional offerings to include systematic psychology and the special schools of psychological theory, and even a teachers' course in the "new" theories of psychoanalysis. The department of experimental education, founded and continued by Professor Radosavljevich, was a unique contribution of this famed savant who retired only recently and whose department was so intimately tied up with "Professor Rado," the man, that it was unthinkable to continue it formally without him. His course offerings brought a touch of the best in European experimentalism to American education. Few institutions of the day offered such courses as Radosavljevich's Anthropological Study of School Children, Payne's Education in Accident Prevention, and Withers' Seminar in School Surveys and School Surveying.

This sampling of the School of Education in 1923 indicates something of the spirit of the School of Education in this day. The effort to overflow the narrow boundaries of traditional work in professional education is amply illustrated. The new areas and new courses here charted can hardly be regarded as a shrewd effort to pre-empt students, for there was no dearth of students. They came; it was a question of what would be offered them as they arrived, impelled into coming by the community's faith in education. The explanation of the phenomenon of rich variety in the midst of facilities so strained as to discourage innovation must be found in the School of Education's administrative policy of seeking to recognize the unmet needs of the students and teachers who came pretty much willy-nilly, often unaware, themselves, of the serious social failures made by

the public-school systems of which they were a part. The School faced the fact that significant improvement was no mere matter of more degrees, more "hours" of credit, more refresher work. It pioneered, and not without the usual criticisms afforded educational pioneers, in the building of new courses, new curricula, and in the tapping of hitherto untapped areas of teacher assistance.

When the School of Education was first founded in 1922, it was regarded as a professional school for graduates of colleges and for those undergraduates who had completed at least two years of academic work elsewhere. Not for several years after its inauguration did the School undertake to receive freshman undergraduate students directly from high school. The earlier arrangement was standard practice for most of the university schools of education then in existence, and it remains a very common practice even today. The philosophy underlying this split curriculum was very early challenged by the School of Education as it continued to apply to its curriculum building the test of "what experiences and curriculum arrangements will produce teachers who can serve our public needs." It was soon felt that prospective teachers needed a treatment of content work that would demonstrate the possibilities inherent in each field for the improvement of our social relationships. To take a single illustration, it was felt that an introductory course in chemistry which served the preprofessional needs of medical doctors, industrial chemists, or research scholars was hardly the course that would cause teachers of chemistry to see what was in that particular field for the elementary-, secondary-, and general-education programs which they would be working in. This kind of thinking is identified in educational history as the struggle to overcome premature specialization and to focus upon the preparation of teachers who looked at the "whole child" instead of at some subject-matter "discipline." This idea in the late twenties was sub-

scribed to very generally by educational leaders, but the institutionalization of the idea was much resisted, particularly at the college level. Many a charge of watered courses, of lower standards, of inadequate scholarship was leveled against the School of Education as it moved to set up courses to serve the peculiar needs of teachers of the nonspecialized grades through high school. There was considerable snobbishness in some quarters where there was an insistence upon high hurdles for their own sake as proof of "powerful minds," no matter how spectacular the evidence that the identifying of the "powerful minds" in the old terms, at least, was not tantamount to filling our classrooms with powerful *teachers*. Educational pioneering has probably taken a courage second only to that needed for religious pioneering in the world's intellectual history. Eliot at Harvard was only one of many who faced charges of Philistinism as he tampered with the traditional curriculum.

So far as the School of Education was concerned the determination to provide its own courses in content fields reflected no destructive criticism of other undergraduate divisions of the University. On the contrary, the same high regard for the intensive specialization of the scholar and the specialist was felt by School of Education leaders as was felt by those who served the needs of such groups. Sober recognition of the fact, however, that the problem of social control in a democracy has grown ever more complex forced a more complete attention to the general educational product upon which the nation depends for its democratic base. It was obvious that our public-school teachers taught, in large measure, as they were taught in the colleges despite the heroic efforts of professional educators to correct this trend by specific courses in professional education. The School of Education, therefore, accepted the idea that we cannot fill our public-school classrooms with personnel trained as scholars and automatically expect a performance which will

meet the social needs of the masses of peoples who hold the political sovereignty in this democracy. Teaching behavior, it was recognized, is too little modified by courses in education alone superimposed upon a basic training in some subject-matter area of intense specialization. It was not a question of standards; it was a question of function. It was not a question of turning out people lacking in knowledge; it was a question of a different kind of knowledge—a socially useful knowledge. In this spirit, therefore, the School of Education moved increasingly toward an independent existence. A decade after Dr. Withers had begun his work, four-year undergraduate curricula in virtually every content field served by our public schools had been set up. Twenty-five departments had been instituted and half of them were “content” departments—English, mathematics, social studies, science, foreign languages, home economics, industrial arts, religion, physical education, music, art. At least three others, educational sociology, educational psychology, and philosophy of education, gave courses in content work in addition to their other offerings.

It should be reiterated that there was no spirit of smugness or superiority in this move. The idea was simple: teachers need courses built for teachers, at least up to the point where the general values in the several fields are focused upon sharply and directly. A teacher's specialization and scholarship achievements must, above all, be in perspective if he is to help the general pupil. Liberal-arts freshman courses are not primarily concerned in rendering this service to their students; in liberal-arts schools, this value is more typically expected to emerge as a by-product, and it is an emergence which represented too big a risk for the School of Education. Yet, once this perspective was attained, the School of Education urged its students, and made curriculum provision therefor, to take advanced undergraduate work in the liberal-arts college, especially in

the case of prospective teachers of academic fields. A course in the French Revolution, for example, can in School of Education eyes be taken too soon, taken at a point where it may do more damage to a prospective public-school teacher than good. Taken in due time, in the full perspective of the educational job, it may enrich tremendously.

When one turns to further specific evidence of the growth toward the two hundred and seventy different curricula extant in 1946, he is overwhelmed with the illustrative details available for use. Two things are to be noticed in these illustrations: (1) the number and variety of "new" areas of experience which the School sought to serve, and (2) so far as it can be shown from titles and descriptions the "new" spirit of integration and perspective before specialization. It should be kept in mind, also, that practices now almost universally accepted were then taken on, in many instances introduced along the twenty-five-year path here reviewed, only in the face of great resistance. Hardly a new department was introduced, interestingly enough, but that its organizer came in short order to public fame as a leader in education, attesting to the excellence of the pioneer work done in these fields.

As early as 1924, courses in physical education were introduced by Professor C. W. Hetherington, who was to be succeeded shortly by Professor Jay Nash and a large staff of colleagues which included for many years Professor Frank Lloyd. Today, few men in the field of physical education enjoy the eminence of Professors Nash and Lloyd. From the first few courses, the department expanded steadily until at the climax of this twenty-two-year period nearly two hundred courses were listed in the catalogue under the physical-education department. The department prepared teachers of physical education, administrators and supervisors of physical education, leaders in recreation, dental-hygiene teachers and dental supervisors, technicians in physical therapy,



teachers of health subjects, and teachers and leaders in numerous types of nursing-education positions. As was common to all departments, whatever educational service there was to be rendered to public-school students determined the first boundary of the curricular goal, and the final boundary was determined only by the facilities of the department for coping with these needs. The contributions inherent in organized sports, in individual skills, in the dance, in community-health education, in worthy use of leisure, in applied sciences and health, in school adjustments for the physically atypical children were explored and experimented with. The acquisition of camp facilities near New York City and the use of them for all majors during two of the summer periods in a college career and the affiliations with hospitals, community agencies, and private organizations for field-work experiences became a part of the curriculum experience for that group of educational leaders concerned with the physical health and well-being of our school students. Each of the many curricula adjusting to individual specialization interests, in this department and others as well, came eventually to be set up in such a way as to guarantee that no departmental major going into our public schools would become only a specialized technician. The most effective translation of this perennial School of Education idea into a workable code came near the end of the twenty-five-year period when the faculty adopted a report of a curriculum subcommittee headed by Professor S. P. McCutchen. This recommendation provided for a basic core pattern in undergraduate curricula in which at least fifty hours of work would be provided in liberal arts, that is, cultural subjects, at least thirty hours of work would be provided in general educational orientation, at least ten hours in free electives, and not more than thirty-eight or forty undergraduate hours would be provided in specialization. Teachers and educators, it was felt, no matter what their special compe-



tences, should all have the same broad social understandings and sense of the social-educational problem. It was held that a teacher of shopwork is to be no mere carpenter turned teacher, but should be a man as well informed, for example, about the social needs of the student that are to be met through courses in history as the history teacher should be. Indeed, the chief distinction between the teacher of history in the public schools and the teacher of shop should lie in their respective abilities to achieve the possibilities that their fields offer rather than in their *understandings* of just what the respective fields can offer by way of educational contribution. No teacher of French is expected to feel that industrial arts is appropriate only for the comparatively stupid; contrariwise, no teacher of industrial arts is expected to feel that French is appropriate only for the boy or girl who can afford to become a dilettante.

One could canvass each of the departments and note, as in the case of physical education, the tremendously rich variation in offerings. From the small beginnings of 1925, when a vocational-education department was inaugurated by Professor Ralph Pickett, there came twenty years later a large department offering courses in vocational-industrial education, vocational-technical education, industrial-arts education, arts and crafts, vocational rehabilitation, occupational therapy, and aeronautical education. Shopwork of all types, together with methods of teaching shop, was only a small part of the total, comprehensive program. Problems of labor and labor legislation, craftwork in leather, metal, wood, jewelry, textiles, weaving, reeds, plastics, and ceramics, adjustments to atypical children, and clinical practice in occupational therapy and rehabilitation all testify to the philosophy of providing many types of help in this area and of stimulating the recognition of areas where help is needed.

Among the earliest additions to the initial School of Education program were curricula in music education and in

commercial education. These departments also have the distinction of being among the first to provide full four-year programs for undergraduates. By 1925 such famed music educators as Hollis Dann, Isidore Luckstone, and Vincent Jones were on the staff. Today, numerous courses in theory, conducting, ensemble, music literature, history, appreciation, and applied music have been added to the original courses in principles and methods of teaching. In 1925, there were few places in the country where preparation for public-school music teaching could be had. The typical music teacher, if trained to teach at all, had been trained for individual instruction of selected students. All too often the teachers were merely chosen for their own technical skills as performers. What is a truism now was not so regarded in those days: that a virtuoso may or may not have a recognition of what music can mean to the nonvirtuoso, that he may or may not have some perspective of the contribution he is to make to a child as one of a *team* of educators. The musician is no more certainly the music teacher than the carpenter is the industrial-arts teacher, the athlete is the physical-education teacher, the historian is the history teacher. No one denies the great advantage of the teacher having the skills represented in these roles; few will now deny the advantage, not to say necessity, of something more in our public classrooms. The music-education department pioneered a program in this spirit and from all over the country music teachers and supervisors came for help. The spirit of this program was of a piece with the departmental activities throughout the School of Education; the emphasis may appear to be the more significant because so little previous work had been done in this field.

What was happening in music education was to a large extent paralleled in the "commercial-education" department. No one whose experience in secondary schools goes back twenty-five years will forget the special status of com-

mercial teachers on high-school staffs of that day. In many instances, they stood as a separate corps, teachers whose fitness was established on the single criterion of the skills they were to teach. Typewriting, shorthand, and bookkeeping were tacitly regarded as outside the real secondary-school experience. They were vocational skills; they were offerings *in addition*, and the faculty was regarded as *in addition*. A competent secretary from the school office was often regarded as a suitably prepared instructor. It remained for the new departments of business education to stimulate a correction of this view, afford opportunities for adequate training of teachers, and secure a place in the public-school curriculum for this field which recognized the contributions it could make beyond the strictly vocational ones. One lives in a world of business affairs whether or not he earns his living in some business pursuit. An examination of the business-education curricula developed in the School of Education under Professor Paul Lomax and his staff shows the devotion to these ideas which were new and in great need of expression. Starting from a few courses in methods, the department today offers some thirty courses in straight subject matter and some fifteen courses in organization, administration, supervision, and research in addition to fifteen courses in methods and improvement of instruction. Its curricula include advanced office practice with instruction in the operation of business machines, consumer education, courses in the training of retail-store personnel, analyses of business occupations, and the business management of school activities.

In 1926, a new curriculum in homemaking was introduced that led over the years to the outstanding home-economics education department now in existence. When Professor Dora Lewis joined the staff in 1939 and assumed the chairmanship of this department, the offerings were broadened to include many new types of preparation for

educational work in this field. The department now offers courses for teachers of home economics, for administrators and supervisors in the field, for dietitians, nutritionists, and food specialists in commercial fields or schools, for teachers of homemaking, and for teachers and specialists in textiles and clothing. In 1926, also, a program of studies in art education was introduced by Professor Robert Kissack and over the years expanded into the numerous and varied offerings now given. In these two departments, as in the others, there was an effort to provide specialization of high quality but to make the curriculum no mere craft training. These graduates of the new, so-called nonacademic subject fields were trained *in perspective* and with relation to the personal and social needs of the clients who would be theirs: the unselected, total clientele our democratic public-school system envisages.

By 1929, more than forty curricula had been set up, twenty-three departments were in existence, and the faculty had grown to forty-six full-time members and nearly a hundred part-time members. Eight years earlier, the faculty had consisted of ten full-time members and fourteen part-time members. By 1929, it was the rule rather than the exception for undergraduates to be accepted as freshmen. It would be unreasonable to trace, here, the addition of each department, in what is frankly an illustration of the cause of this enlarging scope of service. Over the remaining years, there were additions, drops, or consolidations to a degree which kept about constant the actual number of departments from 1932 on. The academic departments of English, mathematics, social studies, science, and foreign languages were all in existence by this date and continue to the present. In the early 1940's these academic departments merged the two initial years of their undergraduate work into a single curriculum called the Two-Year Program to permit a maximum of delay in choosing the field of special-

ization and to provide a single guidance program for this closely related group of departments.

In the earliest days of the School of Education, what academic work was given in the school, itself, was offered under the sponsorship of the departments of elementary and secondary education. Professors Howard Driggs, Charles Gill, and J. Andrew Drushel originally "attached to" the elementary- and secondary-education departments, became, in due time, the heads of their own academic departments in English, social studies, and mathematics, respectively. Courses in foreign languages were handled in the same manner by Professors Rollin Tanner and Henri Olinger, who, successively, have served as chairmen of the department of foreign languages and literatures. The science department, created at the same time as the other academic departments, was organized by Professor Charles Pieper, who with Professor Olinger remains in active service to date. As an instance of an academic department that profoundly altered its courses from those of the liberal-arts tradition, the science department is an excellent example. Nonmajors in science take four courses organized as lecture-demonstration and group-discussion courses, two in the field of physical sciences and two in the field of biological sciences. The brief catalogue description of these courses illustrates the point neatly. These courses are intended to offer "a liberal overview of the content, methods, and attitudes of science for general education." For the first two courses, there is the added note of "special emphasis on the physical sciences. The integrating theme is man's adjustment to the materials and forces of the environment." For the last two courses, the appended description mentions that there is "special emphasis on biological science. Problems of human adjustment to the environment of living things are solved." For majors, additional specialized science courses on the undergraduate level are offered by the de-



partment and all such students are expected to take final specialization courses in the liberal-arts college. All the other academic departments have a somewhat similar pattern, and all make use of the facilities of the liberal-arts college for their own major students. This is not to say, however, that these academic departments do not offer a considerable amount of content work of an advanced nature. In doing so, however, they plan their courses with emphasis on the relation of this work to the educator's problems of integration, social utility and control, attitude building, and the socially creative outcomes.

With the growing emphasis in education upon speech excellence in all teachers, the English department added to its ageless responsibilities in training for accurate and effective writing, and for literary appreciations, the problem of training for effective oral expression. Every student in the School of Education takes full-year courses in these three basic aspects of effective English training. Dr. Dorothy Mulgrave has been for many years past the pioneer in this newest aspect of English-department service. The foreign-language department, working in a community rich with lingual variations, offers courses in all of the major modern and classical languages and since 1938 has had a strong division of courses in the Hebrew language and literature. This pioneering work in Hebrew, organized under the supervision of Dr. Abraham Katsh, has been one of the department's outstanding claims to fame, and it represents another instance of adjustment to local community needs. New York is a center with a large Jewish population, and it has stood greatly in need of nonsectarian, collegiate facilities for the study of the Jewish language, literature, and history.

Two other additions to the curriculum in the nonprofessional-education departments deserve to be identified. The nonsectarian department of religious education was organ-



ized in 1929 by Professor Samuel Hamilton. Its varied offerings include comparative religion, the nature of religious experience, the educational problem of character building, the problem of developing religious-minded students, case work in religious education, and courses in the Bible. The department of dramatic art was added in 1935, organized by Professor Randolph Somerville, and offers a variety of courses in voice, singing, folk songs, acting, and various techniques such as swordplay, make-up, and stage settings in addition to study of the theater, theatrical productions, playrights, plays, and the history of the drama.

Meanwhile, the basic professional-education departments of the School continued to flourish and to extend the areas of their service. For a number of years, beginning in the middle twenties, there were departments of elementary education, secondary education, teachers-college and normal-school education, and college education representing the various service levels. Reference has already been made to the earliest days of the elementary- and secondary-education departments. Professor Robert K. Speer succeeded to the chairmanship of the elementary-education department in 1930 and his department has become famous as a closely integrated, highly personalized teacher-preparation department. Professor Forrest Long succeeded Professor Cox to the chairmanship of the secondary-education department. In both departments, sharp differences in curriculum were outlined for the experienced and the inexperienced teachers and for those in the different grade levels of the general area which the department served. The teachers-college-education department was organized by Professor Ambrose Suhrie and the college-education department by Professor John Creager. Upon the retirement of these two men, the departments were consolidated into a single higher-education department under the leadership of Professor Alonzo Myers. This department, like its two predecessors, was a

graduate department, and it became possible to secure an advanced degree in the School of Education with a specialization in some content field and a professional education suitable to college and university teaching. From the point of view of the School of Education, the preparation of teachers at any level, graduate or undergraduate, secondary or college, required a unique course offering geared to the purposiveness of the vocation. The formal educational experiences that make the scholar may or may not make the teacher. The School of Education graduate division exists to provide the experiences that will more nearly ensure the emergence of scholar and teacher in the same personality.

Dean Withers taught courses in administration and supervision for many years, but the department came under the leadership of Professor Albert Meredith in 1930, and the course offerings were expanded to include many a new aspect of the administrator's problems. Professor Herman Horne continued to serve as the leader of the history of education and the philosophy of education departments until his retirement in 1942. Professor Charles Benson, similarly, continued in his administration of the educational-psychology department and Dean E. George Payne in his administration of the educational-sociology department until their respective retirements in the forties when they were succeeded by Professors Brian Tomlinson and Harvey Zorbaugh. Both of these departments expanded widely, including a great many courses which were not exclusively educational in nature but which were desirable inclusions in a teacher's preparation. The psychology department began courses in clinical psychology and provided affiliations for laboratory experience in local hospitals and other institutions. The sociology department included a great many courses in the community and community service work under the direction of Professor Frederic Thrasher, and very early in the department's history courses for the social

worker were added under the direction of Professor Rhea K. Boardman.

Of especial interest to readers of *THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY* is the curriculum development of the department of educational sociology with which *THE JOURNAL* has always been identified. Both department and *JOURNAL* were founded by Dr. E. George Payne, who established the former in the very first year of the School of Education's organization, remained as its head until he was made Dean of the School in 1938, and who continues, since his retirement as Dean in 1945, to serve as editor of *THE JOURNAL*.

In many ways, the development of the department represents the fundamental emphasis of the whole School of Education philosophy. In a day when teachers colleges offered at most only an occasional course in educational sociology, the School of Education was offering, through its department of educational sociology, a major emphasis on the essentially social functions of education. Over the years, the subject-matter departments, academic and nonacademic, alike, reflected this view as indicated throughout this summary. But in the beginning when there were almost no subject-matter departments the School made clear its determination that no student would go out to teach who had not had the opportunity to get this emphasis directly. The basic claim to uniqueness which the School has had was epitomized in the role of the department of educational sociology.

In 1932 a separate department was made of supervised student teaching, always an important part of teacher preparation. It was regarded as a co-ordinating department, the avenue into which all departments channeled their prospective teachers and from which could come constructive, impersonal guidance to each teacher-training department, guidance based on the student-teacher performance in the

field as supervised by those who had not directly aided in the preparation of the student. This department was organized by Professor Frithiof C. Borgeson.

One other department, known as creative education, deserves a place in this rapid survey. Like Professor Radosavljevich's experimental-education department, this one in creative education was the "shadow of a man." Professor Hughes Mearns, its founder and its staff, brought to School of Education students in his day a philosophy and practice of creativeness that enriched the personality of thousands of students. He assumed the spark of genius was present in each personality and sought to develop a technique for bringing it to flame. Apart from the intrinsic significance of such a set of experiences, the curriculum significance is to be found in the willingness of School of Education administrators to bring to the student body whatever it was persuaded was vital, no matter what the departmental difficulties. Creating a department for a man's great idea to have scope is as rare a thing to find in educational history as it was valuable in this instance.

Curriculum is not only a matter of "what" and "when." It is partly a matter of "where." Within five years of the inauguration of the School of Education, there was an extensive extension department bringing the course offerings to teachers and administrators in their own working centers. At the height of this service, courses were offered simultaneously in more than two hundred different localities or centers.

This brief recounting, necessarily sketchy, seems to the writer to illustrate a point of view made functional in one set of environmental conditions. Its value to others is only illustrative and inspirational. The essence of these twenty-five years can be reduced succinctly, as follows:

1. A dynamic, almost dramatic, faith in the possibilities of social control through education

2. A recognition that education was falling behind the responsibility assigned to it in our democratic society

3. A courage to experiment, to try the new, to serve the teacher and the prospective teacher in practical terms no matter what the discouragements raised by the traditionalist and the standpatter

4. A recognition that this service to the teacher-to-be demanded a maximum of variations as great as the number and types of educational positions extant or desired

With this philosophy, of course, the curriculum of a school of education is never really completed. Even where the philosophy is constant, the time and place, the needs and settings will force continuous changes, continuous innovations. The requirement of 1940 will not be the requirement of 1950 except in general terms, even if the requirements of 1940 had been completely and satisfactorily met. In the largest sense, dedication to the service of a democratic society is the keynote of this history, but the dedication was reflected in strong and courageous action as it always must be—with an imagination and a foresight that keeps the curriculum the least of the educational lags.

---

*John C. Payne* is Associate Professor of Education in the Department of Social Studies of the School of Education, New York University.



## HUMAN RELATIONS IN TEACHER TRAINING

Dan. W. Dodson

The growth of the School of Education of New York University from an enrollment of fourteen part-time students to approximately ten thousand in twenty-five years' time is a record perhaps unequaled in the history of higher education. The record is most phenomenal when it is understood that Teachers College of Columbia University was at its height as a great international institution during the time this growth was taking place. Furthermore, during the same period, four free public institutions in New York City grew from insignificant proportions to an enrollment of some fifty thousand and a large proportion of their graduates turned to teaching as a career. To the limitations influencing the School could be added the eleven teacher-training institutions upstate which were tuition-free and which in this interim changed from "normal schools" to teachers colleges. Against a background of these facts, the development of the School of Education is truly stupendous and reflects much deserved credit upon its leadership.

Many factors, of course, contributed to such growth but no doubt outstanding among them was the way in which the leadership of the School handled its human relations. This aspect of school administration is indeed difficult to describe much less to define. Yet it is a tangible factor in the daily life of every institution.

The first area of such human relations which should be mentioned is that which existed between faculty and students. Students were not simply tolerated in classes, nor were they handled as automatons. One of the outstanding evidences of this fact is that when the School was pressed for space, the administration did not face it simply as an administrative responsibility but as a student concern as



well. The students were taken into the confidence of the authorities and they subscribed a significant portion of the bond issue to raise money to expand facilities. Such a relationship existed throughout the entire school and was one of the outstanding facts that impressed me when I came to the campus in 1936.

The second factor was the democratic spirit present throughout. The staff members who were brought to the institution were selected for their broad democratic sympathies as well as for their scholarship. They were not self-anointed custodians of the knowledge in their field but were earnest seekers after newer and better ways of improving teacher training and raising the scholastic standard of teacher education. A large proportion of the faculty was drawn from Western communities where the belief and faith in public education in all branches was perhaps stronger than in the East. Under the leadership of an astute administration an *esprit de corps* was achieved which was exceptional and creative projects were undertaken because faculty and students together were searching in the best sense for new and better ways to train teachers.

The third outstanding factor was the way in which this democratic spirit was implemented by course offerings and the program. Significant in this regard is the fact that Dr. James Weldon Johnson was the first Negro professor to be brought to an otherwise white-dominated institution with professional rank. The course which Dr. Johnson taught from 1934 until his untimely death in 1938 was entitled Racial Contributions to American Culture. In it was presented the panorama of the Negroes' contribution to American life. The effectiveness of his work is attested by the research referred to by Professor Katsh in his article in this issue. A course of this kind was designed to meet the needs of the numerous teachers and community workers in the metropolitan area who were for the first time faced with

the necessity of realigning their courses and practices with the ideals of democracy brought so forcefully to their attention by the influx of a large Negro population. Unequipped and ill-prepared to meet these demands, they found in Dr. Johnson's course assistance unobtainable elsewhere.

In addition to Dr. Johnson's, numerous other courses were offered that implemented this same point of view. Dr. Katsh, as indicated in his article, established the Jewish Culture Foundation and offered courses in Hebrew culture. These courses gave opportunity to those working with Jewish groups to understand the background of Jewish culture and the facets of personality in Jewish children which grew out of such orientation.

Dr. Leonard Covello of the Benjamin Franklin High School for many years offered courses in Italian background and his doctoral dissertation on the same topic provided a rich source of materials for understanding the personality problems indigenous to Italian communities. In addition to such courses, some research and investigation was taking place in the Italian neighborhood itself. Dr. Paul Cressey, for instance, in his study of the role of motion pictures, one of the Payne Fund Studies, used the East Harlem community as a basis for the investigation, and his document provided much source material on backgrounds of Italian folkways and mores.

For several years during this period of the growth of the School of Education, the headquarters of the Bureau for Intercultural Education were just off the campus and Dr. Rachel Davis DuBois headed the program of the bureau and also gave instruction at the University on intergroup techniques. The School of Education of New York University has always had a close and abiding interest in the activities of the bureau so that it was only natural that these associations should later culminate under Dean Melby's administration in the co-operative venture between

the University and this organization in the Center for Human Relations Studies.

The fourth outstanding contribution to the development of a human-relations program was the philosophy of intergroup relations which developed in the School under the direction of Dean E. George Payne. This philosophy of cultural pluralism had no stronger source of support than that at New York University. In his graduate course in Education as Social Control, Dr. Payne was constantly attacking the point of view exemplified in the melting-pot theory which held that the goal of all intergroup activity should be to bring all Americans to a cultural uniformity. This was thought by the Dean to be stifling to creativeness. He advocated instead that groups be encouraged to hold on to their unique cultural heritages and make of their creative differences a contribution to American life. His basic philosophy that democracy must encourage creative differences found a sympathetic response in the heterogeneous populations of the community and has become vindicated as an educational approach to human relations by subsequent developments.

Out of the inspiration and encouragement of the Dean came the publication of one of the most outstanding books on the subject, namely, Brown and Roucek's *Our Racial and National Minorities*, later revised and reprinted by the same authors under the title *One America*. This book has had a phenomenal sale and has made a significant contribution to an understanding of the need to preserve the integrity of cultural backgrounds of minority groups in America.

How to make such a viewpoint a vital part of teacher training was ever one of the outstanding problems. Toward the end of the twenty-five years of educational administration new patterns began to emerge.

In 1942, for instance, under Dean Payne's leadership, the editorial program of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SO-

CIOLOGY was changed in midyear to provide an organ for discussion of the ways in which education could help salvage the peace at the conclusion of the world conflict.

It is doubtful if there is any place in the thinking of educational leadership where greater consideration was given to this problem and where a more sympathetic response was made to this pattern of thought. Numbers of this publication dealt with *Philosophies Underlying European Reconstruction*, *Children in a World of Chaos*, *Boom Towns of Defense*, and others of like caliber.

The planning back of this program is set forth in a prospectus which Dean Payne presented to the General Education Board for funds with which to create a professorship in Negro culture at New York University.<sup>1</sup> The Dean remarked that "the most vital and significant weakness of our democracy is the disarrangement of our culture and the failure of the nonmaterial culture involving social ideas, ideals, and practices to change along with the development of science and material civilization. We mean by this that our prejudices, stereotyped views, our social conventions, mores, folkways, and institutions have been handed down from a European background and, in this country, transmitted from parents to children relatively unchanged in spite of the revolutionary changes in ways of communication, transportation, production, and all the elements of our material culture. We can no longer hope that natural forces can bring about or aid the harmonious integration of these elements of our culture. Education must perform a fundamental part in this process, and, unless it does, our democratic civilization may be lost."

He further presented the point of view that institutional education had been concerned only with the development of the intellect and that it had in actuality exaggerated the problems of social maladjustment which beset democracy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unpublished manuscript.

He said that "the problems of democracy in the political, economic, social, and educational fields demand for their solution the elimination of prejudices, outmoded stereotypes, and many conventional ways of thinking and acting. This can be done only if institutional education plays a vital role and a definitely new role." His conception of the way in which the School of Education of New York University could contribute to the development of this new and vital role included, among others, four aspects:

1. A program of study in the field of economic adjustment. In this field he was able to secure a grant of approximately \$50,000 a year from the Sloan Foundation to establish at New York University an Institute on Postwar Reconstruction. While the program was an all-University undertaking, it was under his chairmanship.

2. The second large aspect involved bringing an emphasis in teacher training that would make an effective contribution to the overcoming of anti-Semitic bias in our society. Under his leadership, there was established the Jewish Culture Foundation described in the article by Professor Katsh. This phase of the program has been enhanced by the presentation of an outstanding library valued at \$500,000 consisting of rare Hebraica and Judaica as well as modern literature. There was established as well a professorship in Jewish culture, also described by Professor Katsh.

3. The third major emphasis was to bring to the University an outstanding professorship in Negro culture and education. The conception of the administration was that such a professor should not be buried in a department teaching the run-of-the-mill courses but should devote his time to directing the growing research in the field for the University, to represent Negro interests and give points of view to the faculty, to assist in the development of adequate educational programs throughout the country, and to devote the remaining portion of his time to instruction in Negro his-



tory and culture. Under his leadership, a grant was made by the General Education Board for \$6,000 per year for three years for such a professorship, and Dean Melby was able later to bring Professor Ira De A. Reid to the University on this grant as a visiting professor.

4. The last of these four areas of emphasis was that of politics. To the development of this field, the administration was unable to move, but the prospectus indicated that the fourth major field in which such stereotypes and prejudices had to be met by education was that field which deals with political problems and problems of nationalism as they are related to the social and economic problems of the day. It was Dean Payne's hope that he could secure a professorship for the twofold purpose of research and instruction on this problem.

The fifth contribution that the School of Education made to human relations was the social emphasis given to teacher training. It would not be difficult to trace the way in which educational programs had been built prior to the development of this emphasis. Practically all the surveys previously done of school systems had emphasized relation of teacher load to maximum efficiency in learning subject matter. The testing movement had placed tremendous emphasis upon performance, which meant an emphasis upon achievement in knowledge accuracy; curricula were developed for even the most heterogeneous communities on the basis that all should be treated alike and taught the same thing. Small account was taken of attitudes, which were the real determinants of human behavior. The entire program of teacher training was built around individual physiological psychology; that is, intelligence quotients, synaptic connections, and laws of learning.

Into this kind of educational sterility came an educational leadership with a social philosophy which possessed a realization that there was not necessarily a relation between



what a person knew and how he behaved. The School of Education became the first teacher-training institution in the nation to make a course in educational sociology a requirement for each of its graduates. In addition, the weight of this sociological emphasis has permeated almost every department as illustrated by the leadership shown in the writings of such of the School's faculty as Cox in secondary education, Myers in higher education, Nash in physical education, Manzer in training of nurses, and of course numerous others who could be mentioned here.

It was Dean Payne's belief that the real task of education was detecting those attitudes that clutter up "the effective functioning of the social process" and directing educational efforts to remove those specific mind sets. He encouraged the development of measuring devices that would help isolate and detect these stereotypes, attitudes, and prejudices. It was his belief that they should be isolated in the same way in which the medical profession isolates the bacillus of a given disease. It was only when this was done, said Payne, that we could become objective about our prejudices and do something about them. This viewpoint undoubtedly moved education back to the community with its needs as the place where educational programs have to be built, for the specific attitudes and prejudices that become the object of education from this viewpoint are those that are indigenous to a given community. This viewpoint of teaching was undoubtedly the forerunner of the movement away from the child-centered school to that of the community school.

To implement further this point of view, the School of Education under the leadership of Dean Payne was, toward the end of the era, attempting to give leadership in a research program designed to test this approach to education. A committee of educational leaders from the community, broadly representative of both the public schools and college leadership, had started thinking through the approach to such a research program.

Such a study envisioned a careful research into the stereotypes and prejudices held in some local area of the metropolitan community, with a breakdown of these "blockages" of the social process according to occupational groups, cultural backgrounds, and socioeconomic status. Only when these specific stereotypes had been determined was it deemed possible to move with intelligence in a program of human relations, and only as an attack upon the total social milieu would justifiable results be obtained.

Dean Payne's retirement brought an end to the development of the project, but the philosophy underlying it has permeated much of the work which has been attempted by me in my research with the Mayor's Committee on Unity. The studies on Coney Island, Police Precinct 50 of the northwest Bronx, and the study of intercultural behavior and attitudes among residents of the upper West Side have coupled parts, at least, of this approach with an analysis of the institutional resources of these communities. It must be admitted that those parts of the surveys that were devoted to this emphasis have proved to be the most fruitful in understanding intergroup relations.

In addition, it is notable that the research emphases which have developed since that time have been unusually weighted with this viewpoint. The open-ended interviews, much of the work of Kurt Lewin and his group, and a considerable portion of the research of the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress have all carried overtones of this point of view. Another type of research that also leans heavily on this approach is that of Margaret Mead and her associates, who worked on food habits during the war. The technique of seeking the "culturally standardized response" is simply pulling together the stereotyped ideas in a given culture that relates to foods and food values.

It is fortunate that the previous administration which steered the School of Education through its first twenty-five years had such a worthy successor in Dean Ernest O. Melby. Dean Melby placed human relations or intergroup relations on a parity with labor relations and international relations as the most important problems of our society. He was quick to take advantage of the resources provided by the General Education Board for a visiting professor and brought Professor Ira De A. Reid to New York University. With the same alertness, he took advantage of another offer that had been made to the School of Education during Dean Payne's regime by the Rosenwald Fund and brought the artist, Hale Woodruff, who is a Negro, to the campus.

I have already mentioned that he was quick to collaborate with the Bureau for Intercultural Education in the establishment of a human-relations center and, with the expanding resources of the University, has been able to establish research facilities under the direction of Professor Louis Rath to explore further these problems of human relations as well as other facets of education.

With the creation of a state university and the development of public facilities on a wide-scale basis, the School of Education of New York University will undoubtedly face new adjustments in the future. With this in view, it is needless to say that it will rise or fall largely upon how well it achieves an equitable program of human relations with its students and its public. It is fortunate that it possesses as a resource for this task ahead this foundation which was so admirably laid.

---

*Dan W. Dodson* is Associate Professor of Education, School of Education, New York University, and Chairman of Research and Field Studies, Center for Human Relations Studies, New York University.

## DEMOCRACY AND INTERFAITH

Abraham I. Katsh

### I

In recent years in particular, we have been paying a good deal of lip service to the concepts of brotherhood and equality but we have failed actually to apply these doctrines in our relations with other individuals and with national or racial groups. These lofty ideals may soon find expression in the World Bill of Rights drawn up by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, but actually these too will be abstractions; they will remain primarily a wish or aim of a Utopian character. It is a deplorable fact but nonetheless true that neither the world nor its citizenry is as yet prepared to do more than hold these doctrines as aspirations and ideals to be attained in a more or less distant future rather than as practical principles to be incorporated into our lives; for schools have neglected to train people to translate these objectives into their everyday experiences. Liberal education has long been preoccupied with the repetition of the traditional, stereotyped verbalisms that have little direct application to present-day problems and events and contributes even less to training for better human relations and more effective living for the morrow.

The School of Education of New York University has made a notable contribution to the solution of the problem of education in human relations. During the quarter century of its existence, the principles of democracy, particularly in its relation to interculture and interfaith, have been basic in the philosophy of the School, in its program, and in the life of the institution. In the opinion of many, the most significant achievement of the School is the contribution it made to an understanding of Jewish and Christian cultures and the places of these cultures in the democratic life of the

American people. To appreciate and evaluate properly this aspect of the work of the New York University School of Education, we should pause to examine the state of democracy generally on both the national and the international scenes. It is the vital need for strengthening the adherence to democratic concepts that gave rise to the establishment of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation and the Chair of Jewish Culture and Education. This unique educational channel of intercultural and interfaith activities has wide implications for fostering democracy and better human and group relations, not only for a university community, but for the broader avenues of American life. The fundamental educational and democratic principles underlying the novel approach to this problem by New York University will be treated in the succeeding pages of this article.

## II

It will be well to remember at the outset of this paper that people generally do not follow their ideals in unadulterated form. They live by stereotypes and patterns. Liberal or conservative is a label attached to one who follows a complex of beliefs and opinions held by a given group or social set, with elements which frequently defy logic and consistency. Witness, for example, the situation in our own Army. Because it spearheaded our fight for democracy, it should itself have been a bastion of freedom and tolerance. Instead, it practices various forms of discrimination, reflecting the prejudices of civilian life, particularly against the Negro. The same is true, of course, of many of our social and educational institutions.

Even a cursory glance at the current international scene will demonstrate the extent to which the civilized world has violated and ignored the fundamental social and spiritual values that mankind has evolved over the centuries. The consequences appear in the grim symbols and warnings of



fateful disaster which we see on the postwar international panorama. There is the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, justified by many on the ground of war exigency. There is Lidice, multiplied many thousandfold by the extermination chambers and crematories of Oświęcim, Treblinka, and Buchenwald, which snuffed out the lives of six million innocents whose sole crime was that they were born "non-Aryans" and Jews to boot. There is the wild, fanatical conflict between Moslems and Hindus. Injustice and oppression are reflected in a myriad of incidents and developments on our political horizon. These are all barometers of our current civilization. Little wonder then that our ingrained faith in the inviolability of the human personality has been destroyed. The individual, trained in middle-class values of attitudes upholding the sanctity of the human being, finds himself in a dilemma. It is a crime to assault or destroy an individual, but the same action on a wholesale scale is condoned. The contradiction exemplifies the collapse of our moral system and the need for a reappraisal of values.

What has happened to the basic principles of Judeo-Christian ethics we have preached for centuries and which supposedly are the foundation of our Western civilization? The thin, small voice of the Hebrew prophets and the Christian apostles is ignored. The Golden Rule has been honored more in the breach than in observance, and humanity has again sunk into a moral chaos. In the twentieth century the ideal of "peace on earth to men of good will" is still a far-off Utopian dream.

However, notwithstanding man's spiritual backwardness, he has made relatively great strides in the field of technocracy, particularly in the last decade. We have developed machines that have catapulted us into an industrial age of mass production with a suddenness which has left us little opportunity to make a proper spiritual adjustment. The

machine, instead of emancipating humanity, has subjected millions to economic exploitation, unemployment, and enslavement which characterize our present-day industrial civilization. It has given millions in industry robots' tasks that deprive them of the motivation of creativity. It has crushed human souls. Respect for personality certainly cannot thrive in such an atmosphere.

We have attained considerable scientific knowledge, but we have not utilized it for the understanding and improvement of man as a social being nor for the promotion of human values but rather to advance transportation, communication, and production. We have developed a material civilization, but our spiritual culture did not keep pace. The result was a lack of balance and a stunted spiritual growth. It was like giving an immature child a sharp knife to play with. The material gadgets were employed as weapons for a more efficient and wholesale destruction of humanity. We have simply created a Frankenstein monster that was destined to wreak vengeance upon us. President Hutchins of the University of Chicago has recently said very pointedly and correctly that the split atom will either destroy every man on the globe or make him live as long as Methuselah. The choice is in our hands.

While our astronomers have expanded our universe, other scientists and inventors have contracted our little globe. The airplane has annihilated space so that there is no longer refuge in what a few years ago was a vast ocean. Mankind has been brought closer together; yet we have not learned to know our neighbors or how to live in peace with them. Instead of developing an effective pattern of co-operation and harmonious group relations, there is conflict and strife. The moral hiatus between our industrial and moral civilizations has brought humanity to an inevitable crisis. Either we shall "catch up" in our spiritual culture or we shall perish by the very weapons we ourselves have forged. Either there will be one humanity or there will be none.

Yet the atomic bomb is a threat only in a climate of ignorance, fear, and mistrust. If it is true, as the preamble to the UNESCO constitution states, that "war begins in the minds of men," it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. The ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout the history of mankind of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world which too often has resulted in war. If this pronouncement is correct, it follows clearly and logically that the hard and slow course of education is the proper path to pursue. There is no alternative in this race of humanity against catastrophe.

### III

What does all this mean in more specific terms? It implies that education is potent enough to modify behavior—which is simply another way of saying that human conduct is conditioned more by culture than by genetics. It is the educator's function to inculcate a faith and desire in the individual to rise above his natural self. Just as mankind has liberated itself from the tyranny of nature in the physical sphere, so must it free itself from the tyranny of its natural impulses, selfishness, greed, and lust for power. To do this, the educator must make the student more cognizant of himself and his higher potentialities; he must train the student to think critically, to analyze his reactions and the behavior of his group. In sum, he must transform the human animal into a human and a social being. This requires a twofold process: not only changing an individual's habits and attitudes but also fostering an environment conducive to the exercise of desirable traits and habits. The educator must thus play a double role: he must train the individual and, at the same time, draw up the blueprints and build the foundations of a better society.

This task, however, is too vast and too ramified for the educator to accomplish alone. It involves two major problems: a problem of research and a problem of methodology. We must acquire reliable scientific data on the forces and drives that mold our attitudes and opinions as well as on the roots of our likes and dislikes. When we discover them, we shall be in a better position to seek the remedy. If we had spent for social research only a small fraction of the two billion dollars expended on the development of the atomic bomb, or only a minor portion of the hundreds of millions invested in physical, industrial, or mechanical research, we should no doubt have been much further advanced socially and internationally than we are at present.

This brings us to the second problem, the fundamental question of the approach to be used in training for better human relations: whether to employ the traditional or progressive method in education. The former, concerned primarily with training the intellect, expounds the value of literary or subject-matter learning, the mastery of the "distilled wisdom of the ages," and the application of this knowledge to present-day problems. Learning is, according to this view, a preparation for life. "The learner's mind," in the words of Professor Samuel P. McCutchen, "is conceived to be a deep-freeze vat into which knowledge, information, facts and nuggets of wisdom may be stored until the time comes, five or twenty years later, when the need or opportunity to use them may arise." The progressive, however, urges that education concern itself not primarily with the training of the mind but with the development of the entire personality for practical and useful living. This type of education requires actual experience and participation in vital situations on the learner's level as a means of cultivating desirable habits and reactions making for a rich social life.

The two points of view are really not in opposition since the difference between them is primarily a matter of em-

phasis. It is true that there is little carry-over from formal learning to everyday living; yet both are essentially complementary. Human action should be guided by sound knowledge; practice should have a firm theoretical basis. These principles, applied to the problem of training in human relations, indicate the importance of providing for the teaching of vital subject matter as well as enabling the student to live in a milieu conducive to creative social living, critical reflection upon and reaction to current situations and development.

#### IV

American educational philosophers must take into account the composition of American society. John Dewey has properly stated that "the individual is a member, not of one society, but of many societies more or less loosely connected." America is a nation of immigrants originating from many countries with a variety of cultural backgrounds. Until not long ago, these differences remained in the background, for Americans were united by their common faith in the principles of human brotherhood and equality. With the growth of the nativist movement after the First World War, however, the differences were accentuated, and the question of the role and fate of the minority groups in the American civilization came to the fore. Is it for the common good that the minorities should continue their cultural distinctiveness? Does a cultural group have the right to perpetuate its separate culture, or must it surrender its cultural identity and be absorbed by the "majority" group?

The answers to these questions have been varied. There have been those who advocated a cultural uniformity as vital to the unification of the American people. But factually there is no crystallized native American culture. American culture is in the making; it is not the culture of any single people, not even that of the Anglo-Saxons. The Anglo-Saxon, Randolph Bourne explains, was merely an earlier



immigrant and his dominance in America is "little more than the predominance of priority." America has derived its cultural strength not from any one ethnic source but from the fusion of races and creeds. America is thus a unity in diversity, a many in one, a symphony of a variety of cultures, each playing its part to enrich the total effect. Theoretically, this should be possible, for the ethnic group has the same right to cultural as to religious freedom, though actually, of course, this is not the case.

This so-called doctrine of cultural pluralism negates Zangwill's idea of the melting pot, which requires that minorities cast their cultures into the great crucible of American civilization. The latter hypothesis implies submergence and extinction of the minority groups rather than their preservation—a process that would result in depriving America of the contribution of a component group. By the same token, an ethnic culture must not be regarded as a competitive element in American life but rather as a co-operative force and source of enrichment and as such should be encouraged rather than merely suffered or tolerated. This philosophy, however, is not to be interpreted to suggest a detachment on the part of the minority group from the currents of American life, for politically, economically, socially, and culturally every member and group in the American democracy must share his primary American loyalty with all other citizens and groups in all common phases of American life. Only in the cultural and religious realm does a member of a minority possess a double loyalty, an allegiance that is enriching rather than conflicting.

An education based on the principle that variability does not imply superiority or inferiority would bring about a radical departure from the conventional training we now provide in our schools. We should have to impress upon our students that we are not necessarily superior because we differ in practice or outlook. Moreover, we should aim to incul-

cate sentiments of good will toward other people and groups rather than to derogate their beliefs, tradition, or observances, or disparage them because they are "foreign." This may not be a simple set of principles to introduce into our educational system, but democracy in the age of the split atom can brook no other.

## V

For a century, the social concept in democratic education has supplanted or at least supplemented the individualistic aim. Democratic education has long been defined not only in terms of developing the abilities and molding the character of the individual but also as the process of training a good social being. The welfare of the individual and society is now regarded as interdependent, a view that contrasts sharply with the earlier philosophy of rugged individualism in education. According to the opinions of earlier educational leaders, the function of education was to prepare a student for a career of rivalry in a competitive world. Moreover, the educator was to accept the world as he found it, leaving it to reformers to improve it. The modern progressive educator aspires to build a better society and, as previously pointed out, inspires his students to share in the reconstruction and improvement of our social and economic systems.

Though much has been said of these social aims in education, little of any concrete nature has been done to implement them into our educational system. The school milieu offers a splendid laboratory for research and experimentation and for the evolution of techniques to foster better relations among individuals and groups, yet little advantage has been taken of this opportunity. Educational institutions did practically nothing toward discovering the causes of prejudice and intolerance or toward devising an educational program designed to eliminate them. They were more concerned with concealing or explaining away their own dis-

criminatory practices rather than eradicating them. This policy set a sinister example for students to emulate.

Our colleges and lower schools generally did precious little toward educating their students to appreciate rather than condemn religious or cultural differences. Schools of education should have concerned themselves not only with the pedagogic training of teachers but also with qualifying them to understand, teach, and promote human relations in their schools; but they did almost nothing about it. Only a small minority of scattered and rare departments of educational sociology have seriously concerned themselves with this problem and given it the thought and planning it requires and merits. Yet to ameliorate the situation, a vital display of initiative possessed only by the gifted few is essential. Such an individual who ventured to face the problem squarely and courageously was Dean Emeritus E. George Payne, formerly professor of educational sociology and later dean of the faculty of New York University School of Education; he was one who not only propounded theories but applied them. He recognized that conditions at New York University, a great cosmopolitan institution, with an enrollment of more Catholics, Protestants, and Jews than any sectarian institution of higher learning in the country, were propitious for making it a good testing ground for his social doctrines. He saw that the campus of this institution provided an unequalled opportunity for closing the social distance obtaining among students of different cultural and religious backgrounds. The adoption of this new course and policy marked an important step in transforming the University, and particularly its School of Education, into a vital human-centered institution rather than one merely fostering academic verbalisms. The School of Education thus undertook not only to prepare its students professionally but also to make of them crusaders and vigilant guardians of democracy.

The educational plan outlined by Dean Payne, and initiated a decade ago, called for both a curricular and extra-curricular attack on the problem. A course on the Racial Contributions to American Democracy, purporting to demonstrate to the student the important role played by the various ethnic groups in our democracy, was introduced into the School of Education curriculum. This course affords the student an opportunity to examine the wealth of cultures and ideals that nourished our evolving and expanding democracy. The effectiveness of even one course of this nature in reducing prejudice, the companion of ignorance, was demonstrated by the writer who compared the degree of prejudices of some two thousand students of the University generally with two hundred who took the course on Racial Contributions to American Democracy and found that the racial biases for the latter group were reduced by from 13 to 75 per cent.<sup>1</sup> These figures attest to the value of the educational process as a direct remedy for prejudgment. Real sound knowledge rather than propaganda will aid in immunizing an individual against the virus of racial or group hatreds; it is bound to prevent the student from falling victim to the antagonisms in his environment which, once fostered, are so difficult to uproot.

The department of educational sociology under the capable chairmanship of Professor Harvey W. Zorbaugh now offers a considerable number of courses in intercultural education. A Center for Human Relations Studies has been established at the School of Education which offers specialized training in this field. Yet the philosophy of interfaith and interculture is not restricted to these departments; it is an underlying motif and a guiding principle in the work of the institution generally and pervades all departments. The

---

<sup>1</sup> See A. I. Katsh, "A Study of Racial Prejudices," *Educational Forum*, V, No. 3 (1941); "Education and Racial Prejudice," *Jewish Social Studies*, VI, No. 3 (1941), 227-32.

classroom, however, is inadequate in itself to achieve the purpose of the program. What is of equal importance is the experience of meeting and living together with members of other religious and racial groups, an objective that could be attained only through a well-planned extracurricular program which, incidentally, has the additional advantage of reaching a larger body of students than the formal classroom. The informal phase of Dean Payne's plan was launched on an interdenominational or interfaith basis that served also as a channel for intercultural activity. An Interfaith Council consisting of representatives of the major religious denominations was created and charged with the task of planning, co-ordinating, and conducting a series of interfaith activities. Dean Payne's election to the chairmanship of the board of directors of two component groups of the Interfaith Council, the Christian Association and the Jewish Culture Foundation, was as unique as it was significant.

In line with the plan proposed by Dean Payne, the Jewish Culture Foundation and the Y.M.C.A. headquarters were located in adjoining offices in one of the University buildings, a floor of which was devoted to interfaith activities.<sup>2</sup> A large and spacious social room serves as a common meeting place for various circles and committees as well as a rendezvous for students in the religious organizations, where they meet and get together informally to smoke, chat, and dance. They provided a real opportunity to the students of the various denominations to become acquainted with one another and to live together. A pattern of activities has been developed during the last decade of the existence of the Interfaith Council. Periodic round-table discussions provide an opportunity for students to discuss their personal

---

<sup>2</sup> Recently the University contributed a separate building for the three religious groups in which to conduct their activities. The building is known as the University Religious Center. The building also houses the University Library of Judaica and Hebraica.



prejudices and air their reactions to incidents of intolerance and discrimination gleaned from the news or from everyday life. At these gatherings, students ask many questions on the religious doctrines and observances of their neighbors' faiths, and they receive illuminating answers. A series of lecture forums and symposia addressed by prominent clergy or laymen of the several faiths and attended by large audiences enable the students to observe the common denominator in fundamental religious principles expounded by the representatives of the various religious faiths. An annual mock trial of "Democracy *vs.* Intolerance" or of a kindred subject has proved an interesting means of dramatizing the injustice and consequence of discrimination and prejudice. Religion and Life and Brotherhood Week are observed annually with a broad program which takes in other student organizations at the University. Recently, a fund-raising campaign, undertaken jointly by the Y.M.C.A. and the Jewish Culture Foundation, netted a considerable sum for overseas relief for Jewish and non-Jewish students, but the concomitant value of the project, that of broadening the sympathies of the participants, was regarded as transcending by far the financial significance of the project, important as that was. In addition to these projects, social functions and trips provide occasions for cultivating better relations and stronger ties among the students of different religious affiliations.

## VI

The New York University Jewish Culture Foundation, established in 1937, reinforces the efforts of the Interfaith Council and approaches the problem from the Jewish viewpoint. At the time of its inception there were two representative Christian organizations at the Washington Square Center of the University: the Catholic Newman Club and the Protestant Y.M.C.A. The Jewish students, however,

belonged to a number of independent and unco-ordinated students' groups. There was a chapter of the Inter-Collegiate Menorah Association; another of Avukah, the inter-collegiate Zionist organization; another of the Emunah, a local organization of Orthodox Jewish students; and several other groups. The Dean and the writer collaborated in bringing these Jewish societies together and in inducing them to merge their interests and activities in one all-embracing and superseding representative organization, the Jewish Culture Foundation.

Several fundamental principles motivated the establishment of the Jewish Culture Foundation. It is generally recognized that it is as important for the Jewish students to be acquainted with and appreciate their own cultural heritage as it is to know something about the cultures of others. Moreover, it is essential to establish a direct and vital source of Jewish cultural influence for the benefit of the non-Jewish students. These aims have found expression in the purposes of the Jewish Culture Foundation as outlined in its charter by Dean Payne:

1. To make the Jews among our students conscious of their cultural background and its importance to America
2. To provide non-Jews with a background of understanding, with reference to the vital contribution of Jews to our national and social life
3. To bring about a comity especially between Jews and Gentiles, and to curb incipient totalitarianism which cannot exist in our democratic country without doing violence to our ideals and to our democratic life

The Jewish Culture Foundation operates as an integral unit of the University and is an intra-university rather than an inter-university organization; it is without any outside links. It does not subscribe to any partisan ideology or dogma, its aim being expressly and purely educational. The foundation initiated the Chair of Hebrew Culture and Edu-

cation; it has established the Library of Judaica and Hebraica; and has been carrying on an extracurricular student-activities program.

The Chair of Hebrew Culture and Education, the first of its kind in the country, represents the curricular phase of the foundation's activities and is part and parcel of the University's curricular offerings. It may be of interest to note in this connection that the University for almost a century, from its inception in 1834 to 1922, offered courses in Semitics which were discontinued only because of a lack of funds and interest. In 1934, on the initiative of the writer, a new type of course in modern Hebrew was introduced on a noncredit basis in the Division of General Education, the extension department of the University. The demand for these courses prompted Dean Payne to incorporate a broader program of Hebrew studies in the School of Education. In order to ensure the establishment of these courses on a permanent basis, friends of the Jewish Culture Foundation in 1944 inaugurated a movement for an endowment of a chair, for which a substantial amount has been raised.

Unlike the departments of Semitics existing in many universities and theological seminaries, this professorship fosters the entire gamut of Hebrew learning and provides instruction in the Hebrew language, in contemporary, medieval, and classical Hebrew and literature, and related subjects. The courses are open to the entire student body of the University, thus affording the non-Jewish students in particular an opportunity to become acquainted with the Hebrew cultural contribution made before and during the Christian era. Students in the School of Education of New York University are now able to major and minor in modern Hebrew or in Hebrew culture, either as a matter of professional or merely cultural interest. This program enables students to pursue a course of study leading to the baccalaureate, master's, and doctor's degrees. Those desiring to

teach the Hebrew language and literature in the public high schools and colleges of New York or in other cities which offer Hebrew on a par with other languages may prepare to do so through the training offered by the Chair of Hebrew Culture and Education. Recently, a nonpedagogic curriculum was established, which enables students interested in any field of community service, such as social work, center work, library, or any other area in which a Jewish cultural background may be desirable, to pursue a program of Jewish studies at the University. This program is designed to provide a foundation of Jewish knowledge for non-Jewish students preparing for occupations or activities that would bring them into contact with Jews or Jewish life. Students at New York University other than in the School of Education may enroll in these courses on an elective basis. The curricula provided by the Chair cover a four-year cycle. The courses offered during the current academic year are: Elementary Hebrew, Intermediate Hebrew, intensive course in Oral and Written Hebrew, The Five Megilloth, the Prophets, Contemporary Hebrew Literature, Hebrew Literature of the Middle Ages, Cultural Contributions of the Jewish People, Jewish Customs and Traditions, Modern Palestine, American Jewish History, Literature of the Ancient Near East, The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Archaeology, The American Jewish Community, and Jewish School Movements.

A number of colleges and universities of higher learning have followed the example set by New York University and introduced courses in modern Hebrew.<sup>3</sup> The School of Education of New York University, however, is the only teacher-training institution in the country that has inaugurated a curriculum of such wide scope. This program implies recognition on the part of the University of the value

---

<sup>3</sup> See A. I. Katsh, "The Teaching of Hebrew in American Universities," *The Modern Language Journal*, XXX, No. 8 (December 1946).

of Jewish learning in training better citizens for the general and Jewish community, and affords Jews as well as non-Jews, those vocationally interested and those with a non-professional interest, an acquaintance with the philosophical trends and problems of Jewish life. The University is helping the Jewish community in that it trains better Jewish teachers and administrators as well as a more enlightened Jewish laity. Since the Hebrew curriculum stresses modern Hebrew, it is attached to the department of foreign languages and literatures headed by Professor Henri C. Olinger. The present writer, the occupant of the professorship and director of the Hebrew-culture curriculum, is assisted by several teachers, among them Dr. David Rudavsky, a noted Jewish educator, and Dr. Theodore Gaster, professor of comparative religion at Dropsie College for Hebrew and cognate learning. Recently, the Sidney Matz Graduate Teaching Fellowship was established for a student preparing for his doctorate.

This aspect of the work of the New York University Jewish Culture Foundation is in keeping with the principle that knowledge is a positive means of cultivating better group relations. To the Jewish student, an acquaintance with his culture is essential: it will give him a sense of *noblesse oblige* and a pride in his heritage rather than a feeling of shame or inferiority or frustration which so frequently characterizes the members of a self-conscious minority. The non-Jewish student will develop an appreciation of the Jewish cultural contribution that will instill in him a better understanding and a greater respect for Judaism and the Jew. Of interest in this connection is an excerpt from a letter recently received by the writer from a student in his course on Cultural Contributions of the Jewish People, a young lady who was the president of the campus Y.M.C.A. of one of the largest universities in the country. This is the excerpt:



Before learning some of the facts presented in your class, I had a peculiar idea that Christianity sprang out of nowhere. I only wish that more Christians would endeavor to learn more of the history of their own religion. Perhaps if they did this, the world would have won part of the struggle towards universal peace, an understanding of brotherhood, and a new attitude toward all peoples, regardless of the origin. If more Christians knew that without Judaism the rise of Christianity would not have been possible, they might view the Jew differently.

I feel that basically we all believe in the same things; the differences are only in the procedure rather than in the ethical precepts. Since I have learned these things about the peoples who lived in the early days of ethical monotheism, I have acquired a stronger desire to learn as much as I can not only about my own religion, but also to make an effort to try to substantiate my knowledge with an understanding of my fellow man's beliefs. This thirst for knowledge is definitely a result of the things I have learned these past months.

The Library of Judaica and Hebraica founded by the Foundation is to the Chair what a laboratory is to the science classroom. The late Dr. Mitchell M. Kaplan, scholar and bibliophile, presented some four thousand volumes of manuscripts, incunabula, and other rare as well as current editions to the library. A substantial collection dealing with Hebrew education was donated by Mr. William Rosenthal in honor of his father and known as the Solomon Rosenthal Collection of Hebraica. The University gave to the library part of its Paul LaGarde (1827-1891) Collection. Other collections have been contributed by various organizations and friends of the foundation. The library is constantly used by many students in preparing classroom assignments or term papers and theses and research assignments on Jewish subjects.

Various departments in the University arrange for classes to visit or browse in the library. The library is not only an instrument of research and learning, but it has also become an impressive symbol of the place of Hebrew culture in the scholastic world.

In addition to its formal educational work, the foundation sponsors a wide program of student activities, including the freshman reception, which serves as a means of introducing the incoming students to the program of the foundation. The regular forums, one for the day session and one for the evening groups, are conducted weekly. These are arranged in a series of units designed to give the students a general picture of the basic movements and tendencies in Jewish life and problems or subjects dealing with religion, Palestine, Jewish history, literature, or philosophy. The Jewish festivals are observed as social and cultural functions. The Passover model Seder has become a particularly popular event, attracting both Jews and Gentiles on the campus and serving as a source of enlightenment on the significance of the Hebrew Festival of Freedom.

The foundation, to preserve its educational character, is governed by a board of directors consisting of leading Jewish and non-Jewish faculty members. It is supported by a board of sponsors, which includes a number of outstanding Jewish community leaders. The executive director, himself a full-time member of the faculty, serves as an important liaison with the University. Membership in the foundation is on a nonsectarian basis and carries with it the privilege of active participation in one of the following circles of the foundation: the cultural, social, interfaith, Zionist, Hebrew, dramatics, dancing, and choral groups and the evening-session organization of the Graduate Society. Members receive a copy of the *Menorah Journal*, a splendid Anglo-Jewish collegiate literary publication.

The success of the interfaith and intercultural programs at the University is due to the farsightedness of Chancellor Harry Woodburn Chase and the University administration who saw the splendid educational possibilities and gave the encouragement and assistance to develop the programs. The work of the Jewish Culture Foundation is enhanced by the

interest, enthusiasm, sympathetic understanding, and devotion of Dean Ernest O. Melby of the School of Education, a prominent leader in the movement for democracy in education. Dean Melby has been highly instrumental in expanding the curricular offerings of the Chair of Hebrew Culture and Education and he has given unstintingly of his help to secure its permanency. The invaluable aid of Dean Thomas C. Pollock of Washington Square College of Arts and Science, who combines in his person the presidency of the New York University Christian Association with membership on the board of directors of the Jewish Culture Foundation, has contributed enormously to the advancement of the foundation's program.

In the ten years of its existence the interfaith and intercultural programs have strengthened the unique activities of the Jewish Culture Foundation and have proved their great educational value. The project represents a faith that has been amply justified in the power of education to eliminate prejudice, group tensions, and conflicts and promote true democracy and better human relations as a solution to the world's most pressing problems in the present stage of human development.

---

*Abraham I. Katsh*, is Professor of Education, School of Education, New York University, and Executive Chairman, New York University Jewish Culture Foundation.

## **THE STUDENT-ACTIVITIES PROGRAM: TRAINING FOR DEMOCRATIC LIVING**

**Jesse J. Dossick**

The contribution of an educational institution such as the School of Education of New York University is conditioned as much by its extracurricular program of activities as it is by its curricular studies. We will find, therefore, in the program and accomplishment of the student activities the real key to the democratic significance of the institution. It is really in the extracurricular program of the students that one can discover whether the institution is living up to its professed democratic ideals and practices.

It is in this respect that the student-activities program which I am describing is unique. The program is organized, financed, operated, and controlled entirely by the students themselves. This is genuine democracy. Moreover, during the twenty-five years the administration and faculty have never had reason to be disturbed or dissatisfied with the policies and practices of the students. The students have, therefore, learned in this democratic atmosphere the type of leadership essential in a democracy. They have by their democratic practices and freedom of action made a significant contribution through the school to democratic citizenship.

In this article I shall present a few of the developments of the student-organization program in the over-all teacher-training setting, emphasizing its physical structure, social-recreational and professional activities, outcomes, and the philosophy underlying the program.

The student-activities program of the School of Education of New York University has grown from an organizational meeting of a small group of faculty and selected students held on January 20, 1930, to a size sufficient to provide for the varied social, educational, and professional

needs of more than thirty-five hundred full-time undergraduate students.

I have just completed sixteen years of association with this program, first as a student and then in the position of its executive secretary. My personal belief is that the student-activities program of this particular division is one of the best to be found in any institution of higher learning. This sentiment is undoubtedly inspired partly by loyalty, but it is also a deep conviction based upon such evidence as is here reviewed.

The student-activities program, while sponsored by the School of Education, is controlled by the students themselves through a constitution of its own making and an elected student council.

According to the student constitution, the Student Council shall be a co-ordinating agency whose purpose shall be to co-operate in the promotion and integration of the student activities of the School of Education for the best interests of all. The membership of the council is made up of two representatives, almost always the president and vice-president, of each of the fourteen departmental organizations that represent the areas of specialization in which students major: Art Education Society, Business Students Forum, Dramatic Art Club, Elementary Education Club, Home Economics Club, Industrial Arts Club, Men's Physical Education Organization, Music Education Club, Nurses Club, Occupational Therapy Club, Secondary Education Club, Social Studies Club, Social Work Club, Women's Physical Education Organization; and the four classes: freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior. Every full-time undergraduate student automatically becomes a voting member of the particular departmental club that represents his field of specialization.

The extent of his participation in the club's activities is of his own choosing. It can be as extensive or as limited as



he wishes. In addition to membership in his departmental club, he also is eligible to participate in the voting and activities of his class. Every student, therefore, is represented on the Student Council through the presidents of his club and class. The nonvoting members of the council consist of two representatives from the special-interest or hobby groups, service groups, and the school publications, such as Arts and Crafts Club, American Women's Voluntary Services Group, Bridge Club, Cultural Workshop, Education Playhouse, English Club, James Weldon Johnson Society, League of Women Voters, Men's Glee Club, Motion Picture Club, Photography Club, Science Club, Social Dance Club, nationality cultural groups, the yearbook, *Education Violet*, the literary publication, *Lines and Letters*, and the school newspaper of eight pages, the *Education Sun*. It is interesting to note that the *Education Sun* is an outgrowth of a mimeographed paper called *The Physical Education Sun* which made its debut on October 6, 1930, in two sheets as the first in the country to deal exclusively with physical-education news. By the end of the school year it had grown to five pages and its scope had widened to include news of other departments. Membership and participation in the activities of the special-interest clubs and service organizations are open to anybody in the School. None of these organizations can be restrictive or limited in size.

The School of Education has neither social fraternities nor sororities, although our students are eligible for membership, if invited, in those societies on the approved list in other colleges of New York University.

The School of Education does recognize, however, the honorary and professional fraternities and sororities whose New York University chapters have contributed much to the growth of the School of Education. These are Delta Pi Epsilon, Kappa Delta Pi, Kappa Phi Kappa, Pi Lambda Theta, Phi Delta Kappa, Pi Omega Pi, Sigma Epsilon,

Sinfonia, and Alpha Kappa Delta. The co-operation of these societies has taken many forms, such as contributions to the Student Loan Fund, the establishment of scholarships and research funds, the publishing of professional publications, the betterment of alumni relations, and leadership in our school systems and neighboring communities.

In the beginning of the formation of the program it was the graduate student members of these societies who saw more clearly the possibilities of a self-governing student body and the need for an organization to integrate the growing student activities in the School of Education. They did most of the early planning but always with the idea in mind that the undergraduates would assume eventually the leadership that the council needs. In the first few years of the program these societies were a part of the Student Council, but they withdrew as the program expanded and as they recognized that their interests were primarily professional.

The meetings of the Student Council are held monthly, or whenever circumstances demand legislative, judicial, or executive action by that body. The meetings usually last several hours, and members of the faculty and student body at large are welcome to attend and participate in the discussion. At each of these meetings a printed treasurer's report of expenses and income as viewed against the total budget is circulated among the membership for review and acceptance.

The funds for the maintenance of the student-activities program are collected by the bursar's office in the form of a student-activities fee (nonathletic) of four dollars per term which is paid by all full-time students registered for ten points or more. The University Council upon the recommendation of the administration authorized this charge, recognizing that the activities program is an essential and integral part of a prospective teacher's training. Despite the

several increases in tuition fee, registration and laboratory fees and graduation fee rates decreed by the University, the administration did not increase the student-activities fee during the history of its program, acting consistently with its belief that this was a matter of student control. The Student Council assumes responsibility for the apportioning of the income of more than thirty thousand dollars a year and supervises the expenditure of this money. While the administration reserves the right to give final approval of the student budget, Dean Ralph E. Pickett, ex-officio member of the Executive Committee, has never rejected nor questioned any constitutionally recommended disbursement of the students. The budget includes such items as personnel, building maintenance, school-wide social and professional affairs, class and club budgets, and student-publication costs.

The council reserves to itself the right to elect annually one paid officer, an executive secretary, the liaison between faculty and students, who by the nature of his work finds himself performing some of the duties of a director of student activities, of a dean of men or women, or of faculty members assigned to personnel and guidance advisement.

The work of the council is carried on by means of student committees, in which membership is open to all students. Each committee has definite responsibilities, meets several times during the month, and makes its reports and recommendations to the council, which approves or rejects the recommendations of the committee after consideration.

Some of the permanent committees are the Executive Committee, which is made up of the five officers of the council, the president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and executive secretary; the Budget Committee, which recommends appropriations for the various student functions; the House Committee, which maintains, furnishes, and supervises the Students Building as directed by the Student Council; the Elections Committee, which conducts the elec-

tions under procedures approved by the Student Council; the Educational and Assembly Programs Committees, which are authorized by the council to assist in the arrangements for assemblies, conferences, exhibitions, and surveys; the Social Committee, which conducts the school-wide dances and social activities; the Publications Committee, which recommends to the council policies for conducting all student publications; a Membership and Credentials Committee, which investigates the qualifications of organizations applying for membership on the council or recognition by the School; an Arch Award Committee which singles out annually for service honors to receive the Arch Award key the outstanding student leaders (no more than six) who have contributed most in service and leadership to the program. During the war the Student Council created a Victory Committee to promote and foster activities concerned with the successful prosecution of the war and a National Welfare Committee whose purpose is to sponsor and administer drives for funds or other types of aid for organizations like the Red Cross.

The president of the Student Council appoints the chairmen and nucleus membership of these permanent and any existing temporary committees (with the exception of the Arch Award Committee, which is made up of past recipients of the award) and then extends invitations to the entire student body to become members of any of the committees in which they are particularly interested.

The most heartening and significant evidence of the value of the program to students personally and professionally is presented annually at the reunion dinner of the Arch Award recipients. The Arch Award is bestowed by the Student Council through a quantitative and qualitative scale of "outstanding service and leadership in student activities." Although established, controlled, and administered by the elected student representatives, it is the highest official

award made at the commencement exercises to School of Education graduates. At the annual Arch Award dinners, when former recipients return to honor the most recent recipients of the award and the newly elected Student Council members, the spontaneous testimonials of the contributions made possible by the student-organization program justify the faith that made it possible.

The activities of the School at large are carried on by the individual organizations through their respective programs and clubrooms.

One of the contributing factors to success, I believe, is the constant drive to widen the base of active participation in the program itself in the belief that that is one of the best means of achieving the goals of the program. A good start in this direction is to be found in the numerous offices of the twenty-five organizations plus the club and council committees and the membership of the service organizations of the School.

The social-recreational needs of the students find free outlet through membership in a departmental organization with clubroom atmosphere, its several seasonal parties, biweekly meetings with refreshments, theater parties, Camp Sebago outings, picnics, excursions, bowling, skating, bicycling parties, dinners, class dances and proms, hobby-group activities, all-school social events such as the informal spring and fall hotel dances, the formal Christmas Snow Ball, the Monte Carlo carnivals, boat rides, concerts, varsity musicals, dramatic productions, assembly programs, jam sessions, cut-rate tickets and radio passes, and the game-room offerings of ping-pong, bridge, chess, checkers, informal singing, motion-picture programs, recordings, "drop-in dances," browsing-room library facilities, social lounges, entertaining lectures, demonstrations and exhibits. The attainment of a happy balance to the above through educational and professional activities has been realized through the plan-



ning, initiating and promoting, and carrying out of such programs as this sampling sponsored by the individual clubs: the Art Club exhibit of student work, its participation in the Eastern Arts Association Conference, demonstrations of painting, talks from commercial artists; the School performances of the dramatic-art majors as part of their laboratory work; the group work of the Elementary Education Club girls and their participation in the activities of the Association of Childhood Education; the Home Economics Club's fashion show, Founders' Day dinner, use of the Students Building as a laboratory in furnishing, interior decorating, managing; the Industrial Arts Club's exhibits of work from the shops of high schools, from our own college, and of manufacturers' materials and the club's Christmas work for the community in distributing annually repaired toys to neighborhood organizations; the Men's Physical Education Organization's Sports Night; the Women's Physical Education Organization's Play Day; the annual intercultural program of the Nurses Club with proceeds going to the Helen C. Manzer Scholarship Fund; the Occupational Therapy Club's work in community settlements and institutions; the Photography Club's and the Science Club's exhibits of student work and demonstrations; the Social Work Club's seminars, field trips, and talks from leaders of the various social agencies; the Social Studies Club's forums, debates, and Workshop in Democracy; and the Music Club's Christmas and spring concerts.

The school at large, through its Student Council and committees, has sponsored an annual High School Leaders Conference since March 1934, the purpose of which is to gather presidents and other leaders of high-school student councils and clubs from sixty odd schools in the Greater New York area to study student-government problems and practical phases of clubwork for the purpose of benefiting mutually from the exchange of experiences, ideas, and programs.

These conferences have been gratifyingly successful as attested by the numbers of schools and students attending and our after-correspondence with them. A similar Conference for College Leaders got its start in March 1941.

Two International Student Conferences on Crime Prevention were held in the latter part of 1936 and 1937. Outstanding citizens in the fields of crime prevention, education, and law participated. These included government officials, social workers, representatives from parent-teacher associations, law-enforcement agencies, and student groups to discuss ways and means of eliminating crime and delinquency and to answer the criticism that the crime wave of the mid-thirties could be attributed to the failure of the schools.

The student body extended its support of professional activities through attendance and participation on panels of the annual Junior High School Conference, the Eastern States Association of Teacher Colleges, the Modern Language Conference, the numerous special, topical, or timely conferences sponsored by the administration of our School of Education, and finally through annual cultural presentations of varying titles such as Pageant of American Culture and Cultural Mosaics.

The student government with its accompanying machinery needed to carry out all of these programs and many more to provide the students with the experiences of participation for purposeful living in a school democracy. Additional civic experience was derived from student exchange on problem of student government brought on through efforts to effect constitutional changes, change in election procedure, and experimenting with a new type of student representation such as the new class-board setup.

Some of the most rewarding experiences of our student leaders arose out of conflict and dispute within the Student Council, clubs, classes, and committees.

Newspaper editorial opinion at various times attacking council action which it considered lethargic, inept, or incorrect has often served to stimulate student reaction. On one or two occasions the Publications Committee of the Student Council has called the various publications to task, and in one instance suspended the managing board of the *Education Sun* and operated the paper. Club suspensions or budget suspensions on several occasions have brought in their wake much healthy controversy, as have clashes on various types of programs, letters to the editor, and activities of political groups like the American Students Union.

University-wide issues, such as a call for de-emphasis of big-time football and the adoption of a more extensive intramural program, have claimed the full attention of the students, as have such issues as the overcrowded conditions of the libraries, elevators, bookstore, and cafeteria, or a call to break off relations with athletic teams of colleges that had displayed discriminatory tactics against members of ours.

Out of these common experiences have come growth, understanding, and maturity, and they have provided the material training ground for leadership.

These experiences were not confined, however, to school matters alone, for the student body was not asleep to the vital issues confronting them as citizens of our nation, state, and city as well as citizens of the school. They took stands on the loyalty-oath bills and supported the faculty in its opposition to the bills. They denounced the Hearst press at the same time as Charles Beard uttered his now famous and oft-quoted statement concerning that publisher. They discussed the plight of youth in the crisis of the mid-thirties, discussed antiwar measures, attacked repressive methods against academic freedom practiced in some other institutions of higher learning, and supported federal aid for education. The Student Council petitioned the American

Olympic Commission to boycott the Olympic games being scheduled in Berlin in 1936 and urged that the games be held instead in some country where discrimination was not practiced.

They staged peace rallies with the support of the Chancellor and the deans on the Square. As the crisis deepened, however, and the outbreak of war came in 1941, the School gave its full support to the war effort and maintained a fairly high standard of achievement despite the fact that enrollment was cut in half with the men students constituting only about 20 per cent of their former numbers.

During the war years, in the words of Dean Payne, students and faculty faced a double task, "the winning of the war and the solution of postwar problems in the interest of a world of peace, human welfare, and brotherhood." The Student Council, with the aid of the clubs, various committees, and our chapter of the American Women's Voluntary Services, sponsored war-bond rallies, Red Cross drives, book campaigns, blood-bank quotas, volunteer services, conservation drives, dances, parties, and entertainment for servicemen, postwar reconstruction seminars, and a host of other activities geared to help the war effort and morale.

Some time before the outbreak of war a survey of several hundred college and university student-activities programs was made by one of our committees through a questionnaire and examination of the respective college-student handbooks which revealed that our program could claim a number of superior attributes.

For example, our students have enjoyed complete autonomy in the control of their student life, and as a result the internal organization and operation of student government is wholly democratic. This cannot be said of a surprisingly large number of other college programs. Mr. William G. Averitt, education editor of the *New York Herald Tribune* in March 1948, recognized this when he listed in one of his

Sunday feature stories "a staunch belief in campus democracy" as one of the new factors and new emphases emerging in the postwar tradition.

The explanation for the earlier prevailing attitude would seem to be in the apathetic or rigid control wielded by the faculty and deans of these institutions in their administration of student life and government. Professor Fretwell would seem to concur in this conclusion when he states in his Foreword to a handbook on campus activities, published several years ago, that "the college as an institution often failed to develop a constructive policy itself for the guidance of student life, or to aid students in developing such a policy. Frequently, there was indifference or inhibition rather than institutional leadership in developing a constructive policy."

This charge could not be made against the administration of the School of Education. It is evident, for example, that Dean Payne had given serious thought concerning the existing administrative policy with respect to student life, for he had already anticipated Professor Fretwell's conclusion when he stated in one of his first reports to the Chancellor: "It is a strange fact in the history of education that educators have assumed that youth could become effective and enthusiastic citizens in a democracy by learning the history of our democratic past without the opportunity of actively participating in the social life as a part of learning. They have experimented with the various forms of student government but these efforts, for the most part, have been inadequate and futile. Usually after an experimental period and after the enthusiasm has lagged, the effort has been discontinued with no permanent influence upon educational practice. The reason for the failure of their experimental efforts is obvious. They have been artificial attempts to impose their adult concepts and practices upon youth, and youth would have nothing to do with their unreality."



The survey of student activities at other institutions of higher learning, mentioned earlier, brought home sharply the fact that the physical organization of our program was singular in the sense that no other college was similar to ours in physical structure and pattern. This latter indicates nothing other than the peculiarity of our setup found its origin in the School's own internal physical make-up with its emphasis on departmental lines and that it then developed historically from this base through accumulated experiences.

As is not uncommon, most of the student activities are centralized in a student building.

Cramped quarters have frustrated the University's personnel for the past two decades because of the many difficulties that confront us in acquiring additional building space at Washington Square, and yet Dean Withers, determined to encourage the growth of the program, turned over to the students for their use, and put under their management, five floors of the six in this little red-brick building facing the Square on the east.

Another outcome of the survey mentioned earlier was the revelation that no other students' union building of the colleges questioned had been entrusted to the students for their co-operative management and operated with so few rules.

James R. Bash pointed out in a recent issue of *School and Society* that one of the functions of the average college union is to provide the student with a place for wholesome relaxation and recreation.<sup>1</sup>

Our Students Building meets this function, serving as a social and recreational center for School of Education students who are almost all commuters from within the metropolitan area. At the same time, the functions and values of

---

<sup>1</sup> James R. Bash, "The Function of the College Union," *School and Society*, LXVI (August 16, 1947), 121.

the program itself as recognized by the administration, faculty, and students encompass a broader scope.

It would seem that much of the success of the student-activities program has come about through the formulation of this philosophy of what should constitute the purpose and outcomes of the program evolved over the years through the joint efforts of the administration, faculty, and students.

Chancellor Chase set one of the keynotes when he stated that "where the college classroom may fail, student activities will help in the adapting of our students to the contemporary life demanded by modern conditions of democracy."

Dean John W. Withers believed that the "student activity program could be a huge social laboratory of a most stimulating and inspiring sort from the standpoint of the student as a future educator and the interesting problems which he must endeavor to solve."

Dean Milton Loomis' desire to encourage participation in student activities led him to state: "It is our firm belief that scholastic success is not hindered but aided by reasonable and intelligent participation in the student activity program."

Dean Ralph E. Pickett remarked in an article that appeared in one of the student publications several years ago: "Our program of student activities has justified the faith with which students, faculty, and administration embarked upon that program. It is small wonder that this is so. A preparation for handling student activity programs in public and private schools is an essential portion of the training which our own student teachers are supposed to receive. What more natural then, than to include in that training an opportunity for firsthand participation in all phases of their own student activities program within the School of Education? We are proud at the way our students have assumed responsibilities for their own program. Our students can well be proud of the results that they have attained."

Dean Payne on another occasion observed that the student-activities program could provide opportunities "for closing the social distance existing among student groups of different cultural and religious backgrounds and to develop capacity in students for effective leadership for work in the various communities to which they will go to carry on their life's activities as graduates of our institution."

To implement this belief, Dean Payne as chairman of the boards of directors of both the Christian Association and the Jewish Culture Foundation brought about the creation of an Interfaith Council on the campus made up of the two aforementioned groups and the Newman Club. The interfaith forums and programs of the council have enlightened large numbers of our student body of the contributions and customs peculiar to each of the religions.

Dr. Julius Yourman, my predecessor, the first executive secretary of the Student Council, recognized as a general principle that "the student activity program in a teacher-training institution should supplement the course instruction so as to prepare teachers for the responsibilities of advisement in student activities in the schools in which they are to teach." An editorial in the *Education Sun* of October 28, 1933, expressed this principle in more detail: "The professional education of the prospective teacher, to be effective, must lead to the ability to counsel in student activities—to plan *with* pupils, to enjoy with them special-interest activities, to develop in them initiative, and to encourage in them self-direction and co-operation. These abilities required of a good faculty adviser, are the essentials of good teaching. By participation in college student activities the prospective teacher can improve her or his ability as a student-organization counselor, as a teacher and, incidentally, have an advantage when she applies for a position."

Consciousness of the need of purpose and benefits to be derived from participation in a student-activities program

can be found in an editorial opinion of the *Education Sun* as early as the October 7, 1932, issue, when the editor indicated that the aim of the paper should be to "help in advancing the idea of the founders of the University 'to assist in giving honorable direction to the destinies of the city and nation'"; and the following week when there was added, "Furthermore, one of the most important benefits derived from participating in extra-curricular activities is the development of initiative and a sense of responsibility which develops from working in a group."

Gleanings from other editorials, student opinion, and faculty statements produce the following compilation which cannot hope to be complete and final:

The student-activities program helps orient freshmen to college life, foster a spirit of camaraderie at the Square, provide the soil for natural social growth, promote friendly and professional relationships between faculty and students and provide means of exchanging ideas and viewpoints, expand the possibilities of a full personal life and develop well-integrated personalities, provide unrivaled opportunities for the development of varied creative talents of a nonacademic kind yet related to intellect, character, and leadership, and learn democracy by living it through participating purposefully and responsibly in democratic student government.

Realization of all these outcomes for each and every student is, of course, an impossible achievement, but I believe that the program offers enough of the right kinds of experiences for a sufficient number to warrant regarding it as successful.

Recognition that no small part of this success can be attributed to the role of the administration can be found in the expression of approval voiced by the managing board of the *Education Sun* on May 8, 1940, on the appointment of E. George Payne to the post of Dean of the School of Education, for "he has succeeded admirably in fostering a

closer relationship and better understanding between the faculty and students . . . . His insight and attitude towards the problems of the students has been unceasingly sympathetic." A year later the editors rendered "homage to an active participant in our student programs—to an administrative officer of the University *at that*. If this seems a bit unusual to you who have spent several years at New York University, take our word for it, it is unusual. For Dean Payne has proved what we have contended for quite a while, namely, that there need be no friction between students and Dean, if cooperation is offered from both sides."

The hallmark of the successful relationship that existed between the administration of the School of Education and the organized student-activities program can be found in its long, admirable record of achievement realized by the former's confidence in the students, in their abilities, and in democratic procedures.

In all the years I have been associated with the student-activities program it has never had any of its formal actions rejected or disavowed by the administration, and, at the same time, the students have never given the administration sufficient cause to feel that its confidence has been misplaced or its extension of democratic privileges unsatisfied or abused.

As the School of Education completes its first laps in its march to span another twenty-five years of successful accomplishment the actions of Dean Melby affirm a continuance of the administrative policy of co-operation and encouragement in keeping with democratic principles as the most fruitful and rewarding that can be adopted toward the student-activities program.

The end of the war brought a rapid upsurge in the student population with the great numbers of returning veterans. Much of the vigorous type of student leadership that had been lost to us is now restored and is hastening the



pulse beat of school life. The maturity acquired from war experiences, the new attitudes of a postwar-minded student body are all contributing to a ferment out of which has come a desire for re-evaluation of our original purposes for possible new outcomes of a student-activities program. I would say that, from this starting point, building upon all the virtues of the past holds out great promise for the next twenty-five years of student activities in the School of Education. For, as Dean Melby has so aptly expressed himself, "Student activities can play an important role in the achieving of our primary obligation as students and faculty to get ready for the most effective participation in this challenging and complicated peace time world."

---

*Jesse J. Dossick* is Assistant Professor of Education and former Executive Secretary of the Student Council of the School of Education, New York University.

## ABOUT THE FINISHED PRODUCT

Ira M. Kline

Students and graduates of the School of Education of New York University are employed in educational service in every part of the globe. Invariably the accomplishments of these individuals may be looked upon with pride by fellow students, graduates, and by staff members who have shared in preparing this vast army of individuals to perform with credit to themselves and the University authorities. The preparation of these men and women represents the investment of their talents and experience under the intelligent guidance, wise insight, and contagious enthusiasm of the teaching and administrative staff of the School of Education throughout the twenty-five-year period.

Among the factors that are usually considered by those who are planning to attend college is the degree to which there is a demand for their services under favorable circumstances after certain stages of training are reached. The reputation of the School of Education throughout this twenty-five-year period was so favorable that its students had no difficulty in securing employment under favorable conditions. Although it is true that colleges assume no legal responsibility in connection with securing employment for its students, it falls naturally in that category of organizations which produce goods or services for consumption. The producer must plan to produce a product that can survive under normal competitive conditions and serve satisfactorily the service for which it was intended. Under any test that may be applied the graduates of the School of Education of New York University have met the most exacting standards. The test in regard to the utility value of the finished product is probably more exacting in the field of preparation of personnel for teaching, supervision, and administration than in most other fields of production. Students

are always interested in the likelihood of realizing satisfactory returns upon their investment of time and money in their education.

Educational institutions must be constantly alert and sensitive to changing concepts of methods and practices. They must also be fully informed and amenable to the standards developed and imposed by authorities that determine the standards which prevail in the area under their control. State certification is one phase of this problem. Each state controls the qualifications that must be met by those who are engaged to serve in the schools under its jurisdiction. It is significant, also, that there appears to be little or no similarity in these requirements among the states even in the same area or section. This diversity of requirements within the area in which a training institution has most of its graduates employed places the responsibility upon it of providing a wide range of course selection. The School of Education has met this problem most successfully through close co-operation with the authorities in the areas served.

Through the vision and resourcefulness of Dean Withers new impulses were given to the program of the School of Education at the outset. The Dean induced men and women whose achievements had been noteworthy to join the staff and share in formulating policies adapted to the changing demands of a dynamic society. He encountered little difficulty because of his tolerant and understanding personality in securing the co-operation of the administration of the New York City school system and of the outlying areas in establishing experimental laboratories in several centers. This liaison with those actively engaged in education at the grass roots enabled the Dean and his staff to observe the problem at close range and consult with and advise those in charge in implementing the personnel and materials of instruction and administration.

Later, the idea of providing training opportunities for students in areas at varying distances from the Washington Square Center was examined with results highly satisfactory to actual and potential students who would otherwise have found it impossible to study under School of Education sponsorship and direction. The development and gradual expansion of this program resulted in an off-campus program that provided training opportunities for thousands of students who otherwise found it difficult or even impossible to carry out their plans for initial or advanced study on the campus. This extension of training services to areas in the field was effected through several devices. One of these was the Institute of Education, which planned and directed an extensive off-campus program for several years and, in fact, is still carrying on effectively. Staff members are still sent into the field for consultative as well as instructional services. The School of Education at one stage in its history pioneered in an off-campus program in which staff members traveled by air to widely dispersed centers. This unique adventure often resulted in considerable discomfort often bordering on hardship for the professors involved.

Upon the retirement of Dean Withers in 1940, Dean Payne, who had shared Dean Withers' vision and enthusiasm, continued to provide enrichment for the program and to recruit staff members whose achievements had attracted nation-wide attention to co-operate with him in maintaining the reputation of the School of Education:

It is impossible within the limitations of this article to deal with the training and educational services of any considerable number of individual students. The School of Education during its first twenty-five years granted degrees to thousands of students. Complete statistics in connection with the degrees granted appear later in the article.

Examine the catalogue of almost any college or univer-

sity within the continental United States of America engaged in training students in education and you will find among the roster of staff members in teaching and administrative capacity men and women holding degrees from the School of Education of New York University.

This situation regarding the activities of New York University graduates will be found to prevail in colleges and universities in foreign countries. If you were to investigate further, you would find the type of service rendered highly satisfactory to the board controlling each institution. In many instances you would discover graduates of the School of Education occupying key administrative as well as teaching positions in colleges and universities in this and other countries.

Thousands of School of Education graduates are bringing distinction to themselves as well as to the School in the field of public- and private-school teaching, supervision, and administration. Their names are legion but space and the purpose of this article do not permit identifying them personally.

Consult these college staff members or teachers, supervisors or administrators in public and private schools and you will discover an intense loyalty to Dean Withers and Dean Payne and their associates.

It is impossible within the limits of this discussion to make personal reference to individuals who after obtaining degrees in the School of Education occupy positions of varying importance in educational enterprises of different nature.

In reporting the thousands of degrees conferred by the School of Education the magnitude of the growth and development of the School within a twenty-five-year period becomes evident.

Following is a detailed report of the degrees granted during the period 1922-1947:



Year	Ph.D.	Ed.D.	D.Ped.	A.M.	A.B.	B.S.	B.S. in Music	B.S. in Dramatic Art
1923	7	.....	1	15	.....	.....	.....	.....
1924	5	.....	.....	18	2	26	.....	.....
1925	10	.....	.....	29	5	47	.....	.....
1926	17	.....	.....	27	7	65	.....	.....
1927	14	.....	.....	43	9	165	19	.....
1928	15	.....	.....	76	3	271	25	.....
1929	19	.....	.....	104	1	405	28	.....
1930	22	.....	.....	115	9	554	28	.....
1931	48	.....	.....	151	7	618	64	.....
1932	59	.....	.....	289	2	744	84	.....
1933	56	.....	.....	505	1	804	76	.....
1934	59	.....	.....	469	4	835	77	.....
1935	35	5	.....	475	.....	764	89	.....
1936	48	17	.....	540	1	749	78	7
1937	35	17	.....	634	.....	723	48	.....
1938	39	25	.....	678	2	652	2	.....
1939	36	36	.....	809	.....	799	2	.....
1940	37	29	.....	841	.....	946	3	.....
1941	37	37	.....	846	.....	858	.....	.....
1942	35	40	.....	762	.....	828	.....	.....
1943	37	44	.....	567	.....	637	.....	.....
1944	36	42	.....	436	.....	549	.....	.....
1945	30	19	.....	498	.....	549	1	.....
1946	15	28	.....	612	.....	547	.....	.....
1947	27	19	.....	965	.....	687	.....	.....

During the period covered in this article the School of Education of New York University certified to the University authorities candidates for degrees as follows:

For the Ph.D. degree .....	778
For the D.Ped. degree .....	1
For the Ed.D. degree .....	358
For the A.M. degree .....	10,504
For the A.B. degree .....	53
For the B.S. degree .....	14,454
Total .....	26,148

---

*Ira M. Kline* is Assistant Professor of Education and former Director of the Bureau of Appointments of the School of Education, New York University.

★ **Special Offer to  
Readers of This Journal**

# EUROPEAN IDEOLOGIES

## A Survey of 20th Century Political Ideas

Edited by **FELIKS GROSS**, New York University

Introduction by **ROBERT M. MACIVER**, Columbia University

"**N**O area of knowledge has greater significance today than that which explores the idea-systems of our age. This book is a contribution to that knowledge. No one can read it without a widened understanding of the forces that are stirring and changing this distracted age. Not only will he gain a new perspective of the movements that impinge on us from without, he will also be in a better position to face the issues that confront us at home."—Robert M. MacIver

### Among the Subjects covered are:

Peasant Ideologies	Political Catholicism	Russian Libertarianism	Trade-Unionism
Agrarianism	Zionism	Regionalism	Nationalism
Pacifism	Hispanidad	Separatism	Nazism
Pangermanism	Falangism	Cooperativism	Fascism
Panslavism	Liberalism	Anarchism	Socialism
Pan-Europeanism	Humanism	Syndicalism	Communism

A sociological analysis of European mass movements is followed in the first chapter by a discussion of the significance of European political myths and utopias, political ritualism and symbolism, mechanism of urban and rural mass movements, theory of political strategy and tactics, and structure of European idea-systems.

**CONTRIBUTORS INCLUDE:** Giuseppe A. Borgese, Lewis Corey, George M. Dimitrov, Nicholas Doman, Friedrich W. Foerster, Rubin Gotesky, Feliks Gross, Sidney Hook, Horace M. Kallen, Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, Reginald D. Lang, Wacław Lednicki, Algernon Lee, Jacob Lestchinski, Alfredo Mendizabal, Stephen Naft, Max Nomad, Gunther Reiman, Rudolf Rucker, Joseph E. Roucek, Friedrich Stampfer, Philip Taft, Elias Tartak, Vladimir Zenzinov.

**1200 Pages**

**\$12.00**

**Special high discounts for bulk classroom orders.**

### SPECIAL ORDER COUPON

**PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers**

**15 East 40th Street, Dept. 91, New York 16, N.Y.**

Please send me copy(ies) of **EUROPEAN IDEOLOGIES**, at the special professional rate of \$10.00 per copy.

Enclosed is \$.....

**NAME** .....

**ADDRESS** .....

(Expedite shipment by enclosing remittance.)

The regular price of this book is \$12. Readers of The Journal, however, are entitled to the special professional rate of **ONLY \$10.00** per copy. Just use the special order coupon, or mention the **JOURNAL** when ordering.

